

The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SOCRATES AND THE ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ.

It has generally been the custom to translate the word 'δαιμόνιον'—whether used by Xenophon or Plato in regard to the claims of Socrates to special divine intervention—as if it were equivalent to δαίμων. Thus Lélut, who devoted a whole book to the subject, brought out his work under the title of '*Le démon de Socrate*.' It is the object of the present paper to show that there is no justification for such a confusion of the two words, and also to show by a careful examination of all the passages where the word δαιμόνιον is used either in Xenophon or Plato in regard to Socrates that there is no connection between the words δαιμόνιον and δαίμων.

There has also been a tendency to arrive at conclusions by disregarding part of the evidence. The extent to which this tendency has prevailed is well illustrated by the essay on τὸ δαιμόνιον, which was appended to his edition of the *Apology* by the late Rev. James Riddell, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford. He takes what he calls 'the chief passages' in Xenophon in regard to the 'δαιμόνιον σημεῖον,' and then makes the following statement: 'Thus we see that Xenophon tells us nothing as to the nature of Socrates' δαιμόνιον, save that it was the instrument through which divine intimations reached him unsolicitedly.' But as a matter of fact Mr. Riddell arrives at this conclusion, by omitting altogether a number of passages in which the word

δαιμόνιον is used; while incidentally it should be noticed that Xenophon never uses the actual words 'δαιμόνιον σημεῖον' at all.

I submit that a careful and complete study of the word δαιμόνιον in the *Memorabilia* is the only satisfactory method of attaining to the real meaning which Xenophon meant the word to convey. And if there is any one English word which, after such an examination, can be used, without violating the sense, to translate the Greek δαιμόνιον in every single instance where it is employed by Xenophon, it would seem that we should be justified in believing that we have obtained an adequate translation. This is the method employed in the interpretation of particular words and phrases in elucidating such documents as wills and settlements; and it would seem to be the only satisfactory or scientific method. The particular author must be his own interpreter.

Now the first time that the word δαιμόνιον occurs in the *Memorabilia* is in Book I., ch. I., § 1. ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης οὓς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων, ἕτερα δὲ καὶνὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρων. [Socrates is indicted for not believing in the gods in whom the State believes, and for introducing other new deities.]

Even apart from other passages in the *Memorabilia*, δαιμόνιον here would appear to be an alternative synonym for θεός; and we shall presently see that this view

is confirmed by three separate passages in different parts of the *Memorabilia*.

The next passage is in section 2 of ch. I, Book I.: διετεθρύλητο γὰρ ὡς φαίη Σωκράτης τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐαυτῷ σημαίνειν ὅθεν δὴ καὶ μάλιστα μοι δοκοῦσιν αὐτὸν αἰτιάσασθαι καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν. Here the word is used twice—once in the singular and once in the plural—in two lines; and the same meaning must obviously be given, if possible, in both instances. And as καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια must mean (as before) 'new deities' (or 'divinities'), τὸ δαιμόνιον must mean 'the deity.'

The other passages in Xenophon are Book I., ch. I., § 4: Σωκράτης δ' ὥσπερ ἐγίγνωσκεν, οὕτως ἔλεγε. τὸ δαιμόνιον γὰρ ἔφη σημαίνειν καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν συνόντων προηγόρευε τὰ μὲν ποιεῖν, τὰ δὲ μὴ ποιεῖν, ὡς τοῦ δαιμόνιου προσημαίνοντος. καὶ τοῖς μὲν πειθόμενοις αὐτῷ συνέφερε, τοῖς δὲ μὴ πειθόμενοις μετέμελε. καίτοι τίς οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσειεν αὐτὸν βούλεσθαι μὴτ' ἡλίθιον μὴτ' ἀλάζονα φαίνεσθαι τοῖς συνούσιν; ἐδόκει δ' ἂν ἀμφοτέρω ταῦτα, εἰ προαγορεύων ὡς ὑπὸ θεοῦ φαινόμενα, καὶ ψευδόμενος ἐφαίνετο. N.B. In this passage, similarly but conversely to the first, θεός would seem to be an alternative synonym for δαιμόνιον; and τὸ δαιμόνιον must in each case be translated 'the deity.'

Book I., ch. 3, § 4, where the word δαιμόνιον is not actually used, but οἱ θεοὶ seem to be the equivalent. εἰ δέ τι δόξειεν αὐτῷ σημαίνεσθαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν, ἥττον ἂν ἐπέισθη παρὰ τὰ σημαινόμενα ποιῆσαι, ἢ εἰ τις αὐτὸν ἔπειθεν ὁδοῦ λαβεῖν ἡγόμενα τυφλὸν καὶ μὴ εἰδότα τὴν ὁδόν, ἀντὶ βλέποντος καὶ εἰδότος.

Book I., ch. 4, § 2: λέξω δὲ πρῶτον ἃ ποτε αὐτοῦ ἤκουσα περὶ τοῦ δαιμονίου διαλεγόμενον πρὸς Ἀριστόδημον τὸν μικρὸν ἐπικαλούμενον. It is impossible to quote the whole context, which is somewhat lengthy, but a careful study of the chapter will show that τὸ δαιμόνιον in this particular passage cannot refer to the special revelation of the deity to which Socrates laid claim; for the whole purport of the chapter is to prove the existence of the deity by the wonders of man's bodily and mental powers. And that the words τὸ δαιμόνιον as used here by

Xenophon are really an alternative synonym for θεοί or ὁ θεός seems especially clear from the frequent use of those words as alternative terms in Book I., ch. 4, §§ 10-19. Thus in § 10 we find καὶ ὁ Ἀριστόδημος, Οὔτοι, ἔφη, ἐγώ, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὑπεροῶ τὸ δαιμόνιον, ἀλλ' ἐκείνο μεγαλοπρεπέστερον ἡγοῦμαι ἢ ὡς τῆς ἐμῆς θεραπείας προσδεῖσθαι. ('And Aristodemus said, Neither do I, O Socrates, condemn the deity, but I deem it too magnificent to require my service.') In the remainder of the argument—which is continued till the end of the chapter—the word θεοί is used seven times, οἱ θεοί is used (alternatively) twice, ὁ θεός is used (alternatively) three times, and τὸ θεῖον is used (alternatively) once.

In Book IV., ch. 3, Socrates once more expatiates on the divine goodness as made manifest to men. From section 12 to section 18 the words οἱ θεοί are used seven times, the word θεοί is used three times, the words τὸ θεῖον once, and the words τὸ δαιμόνιον twice; and the context seems clearly to show that these different words in each case refer to the same thing, just as in English we might alternatively employ the terms 'god,' 'the godhead,' 'the deity,' or 'the divinity.'

And that the words τὸ δαιμόνιον, which are twice used in this passage, must refer to the deity in general is apparent not only from the whole argument, but from the actual context in which they occur, in IV. 3. 14: ἃ χρὴ κατανοοῦντα μὴ καταφρονεῖν τῶν ἀοράτων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν γιγνομένων τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν καταμανθάνοντα τιμᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον. Ἐγὼ μὲν, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἔφη ὁ Εὐθύδημος, ὅτι μὲν οὐδὲ μικρὸν ἀμελήσω τοῦ δαιμονίου σαφῶς οἶδα. ἐκείνο δὲ ἀθυμῶ, ὅτι μοι δοκεῖ τὰς τῶν θεῶν εὐεργεσίας οὐδ' ἂν εἰς ποτε ἀνθρώπων ἀξίαις χάρισιν ἀμείβεσθαι.

In Book IV. the expression τὸ δαιμόνιον occurs again, and is used thrice. Even here, though primarily referring to the particular manifestation claimed by Socrates, it also clearly refers to the deity in general. This is, I think, made certain by the fact that in the latter of the two passages to be quoted, the words τῷ θεῷ are evidently synonymous with τὸ δαιμόνιον used just before.

(a) Ch. 8, § 1: Εἰ δέ τις, ὅτι φάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐαυτῷ προσημαίνειν ἃ τε δεοὶ καὶ ἃ μὴ δεοὶ ποιεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν δικαστῶν κατεγνώσθη θάνατος, οἴεται αὐτὸν ἐλέγχεσθαι περὶ τοῦ δαιμονίου ψευδόμενον, ἐννοησάτω πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι οὕτως ἤδη τότε πόρρω τῆς ἡλικίας ἦν, ὥστ' εἰ καὶ μὴ τότε, οὐκ ἂν πολλῷ ὕστερον τελευτῆσαι τὸν βίον.

(b) Ch. 8, §§ 5 and 6: αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν εἰπεῖν, Οὐχ ὅρᾳς, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὅτι οἱ Ἀθηῆνσι δικασταὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἤδη μηδὲν ἀδικούντας λόγῳ παραχθέντες ἀπέκτειναν, πολλοὺς δὲ ἀδικούντας ἀπέλυσαν; Ἀλλὰ νῆ τὸν Δία, φάναι αὐτόν, ὦ Ἑρμόγενης, ἤδη μου ἐπιχειροῦντος φροντίσαι τῆς πρὸς τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀπολογίας ἡναντιώθη τὸ δαιμόνιον, καὶ αὐτὸς εἰπεῖν, Θαναταστὰ λέγεις. τὸν δέ, Θανμάξεις, φάναι, εἰ τῷ θεῷ δοκεῖ βέλτιον εἶναι ἐμὲ τελευτᾶν τὸν βίον ἢ ἄλλῃ;

[Note.—Xenophon also uses the word δαιμόνιος as an adjective in three places in the *Memorabilia*, (a) Book I., ch. 1, § 9: τοὺς δὲ μηδὲν τῶν τοιούτων οἰόμενους εἶναι δαιμόνιον, ἀλλὰ πάντα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης γνώμης, δαιμονῶν ἔφη. (b) Book I., ch. 1, § 12: τὰ μὲν ἀνθρώπεια παρέντες, τὰ δαιμόνια δὲ σκοποῦντες. (c) Book I., ch. 3, § 5: εἰ μὴ τι δαιμόνιον εἴη. In none of these three passages has the word any bearing on the subject of our inquiry.]

So far then as Xenophon is concerned, we find that he uses the word δαιμόνιον as a substantive twelve times in all in the *Memorabilia*. At least six times the reference is clearly general, and has no primary or direct connection with the particular manifestation of the deity to which Socrates laid claim. Of the other six instances where the word is used, there is no real reason why the first five should not have a general reference, even though they also apply to the warnings which Socrates stated that he received. And in the last instance (Book IV., chapter 8, section 5) the immediate collocation of the words τῷ θεῷ would seem to show that even here τὸ δαιμόνιον is merely as alternative for ὁ θεός. Under these circumstances it would seem doubtful whether such an expression as the 'daemon of Socrates' can in any way be warranted by the facts of the case. In other words, so far at least as Xenophon is concerned,

it would seem that wherever the word δαιμόνιον is used the most natural and reasonable translation is supplied by the English word 'deity' (or 'divinity').

I submit, therefore, that so far as Xenophon is concerned, Mr. Riddell's assertion that 'τὸ δαιμόνιον is but the instrument, while it is the gods who are the agents' is entirely unwarranted; seeing that in two different chapters the words 'τὸ δαιμόνιον,' 'θεοὶ,' 'οἱ θεοί,' and 'ὁ θεός,' are clearly used as alternative terms to express the deity. And when Mr. Riddell further states that 'all Xenophon's notices of it encourage the view that it was the quick exercise of a judgment informed by knowledge of the subject, trained by experience, and inferring from cause to effect without consciousness of the process,' it is clear that he can only make such a statement by neglecting, as he has done, the passages which disprove it. Thus he omits *Mem. I. i., 1, Mem. I. iii., 4, Mem. I. iv., 10, Mem. IV. iii., 14*; whereas to obtain Xenophon's real meaning it is clearly necessary to examine the meaning of the word, wherever it occurs in his pages.

When we turn to Plato, and examine his use of the word δαιμόνιον we find a curious difference. Xenophon, as we have seen, always uses the word as a substantive; but in Plato we find a double usage, sometimes adjectival, and sometimes substantival. The substantival usage appears to occur four times.

(a) *Euthyphro*. 2 b: ΕΥΘ. καὶ μοι λέγε, τί καὶ ποιοῦντά σε φησι διαφθείρειν τοὺς νέους; ΣΩ. Ἀποπα, ὦ θανμάστε, ὡς οὕτω γ' ἀκούσαι. φησὶ γάρ με ποιητὴν εἶναι θεῶν, καὶ ὡς καινοὺς ποιοῦντα θεοὺς τοὺς δ' ἀρχαίους οὐ νομίζοντα ἐγράψατο τούτων αὐτῶν ἕνεκα, ὡς φησιν. ΕΥΘ. Μανθάνω, ὦ Σώκρατες. ὅτι δὴ σὺ τὸ δαιμόνιον φῆς σαυτῷ ἐκάστοτε γίγνεσθαι.

It is hard to see how δαιμόνιον here can be translated by any other word than 'deity' (or 'divinity'). Moreover, it must be noticed that whereas in the indictment as given in Xenophon the words used are καινὰ δαιμόνια (*Mem. Book I., ch. i., § 1.*), and the same phrase is used in the *Apology* (ἕτερα δαιμόνια καινὰ), the words used here are καινοὺς θεοὺς. This fact alone

seems to show that when Plato uses the word *δαιμόνιον* as a substantive, he uses it as an alternative to *θεός*.

(b) *Apology* 24b: ἔχει δὲ πῶς ὧδε· Σωκράτη φησὶν ἀδικεῖν τοὺς τε νέους διαφθείροντα καὶ θεοὺς οὓς ἡ πόλις νομίζει οὐ νομίζοντα, ἕτερα δὲ δαιμόνια καινά.

Here again the context seems to show that *δαιμόνια* must be translated by 'deities'; and there is a further proof that *δαιμόνια* and *θεοί* are simply alternative words to express the same thing in *Apol.* 27a: Οὐτὸς γὰρ ἐμοὶ φαίνεται τὰ ἐναντία λέγειν αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ ἐν τῇ γραφῇ ὥσπερ ἂν εἴποι. 'Ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων, ἀλλὰ θεοὺς νομίζων.' The substitution here of *θεοὺς* for *δαιμόνια* in the second term of the passage seems to show beyond all possibility of doubt that the two words are alternatives not less in Plato than in Xenophon.

(c) *Apol.* 40 a-b: ἡ γὰρ εἰωθὺία μοι μαντική ἡ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐν μὲν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ παντὶ πάνυ πυκνὴ αἰεὶ ἦν καὶ πάνυ ἐπὶ σμικροῖς ἐναντιούμενη, εἴ τι μέλλοιμι μὴ ὀρθῶς πράξειν. νυνὶ δὲ ξυμβέβηκέ μοι, ἄπερ ὁράτε καὶ αὐτοὶ ταυτὶ ἂ γε δὴ οἰηθείη ἂν τις καὶ νομίζεται ἔσχατα κακῶν εἶναι. ἐμοὶ δὲ οὔτε ἐξιώντι ἔωθεν οἴκοθεν ἡραντιώθη τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σημεῖον, οὔτε ἡνίκα ἀνέβαινον ἐπὶ τὸ δικαστήριον, οὔτε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ οὐδαμοῦ μέλλοντι τι εἶρεῖν. καίτοι ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις πολλαχοῦ δὴ με ἐπέσχε λέγοντα μεταξὺ.

Here again τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σημεῖον is clearly an alternative expression for μαντικὴ ἡ τοῦ δαιμονίου, and it seems therefore equally clear that *δαιμόνιον* and *θεός* are used as alternatives. When, therefore, Plato uses the phrase τὸ δαιμόνιον as a substantive, it seems clear that in each instance he uses it as practically equivalent to *θεός*.

(d) *Theaet.* 151a: οὓς, ὅταν πάλιν ἔλθωσι δέομενοι τῆς ἐμῆς συνουσίας καὶ θαυμαστὰ δρῶντες, ἐνίοις μὲν τὸ γινώμενον μοι δαιμόνιον ἀποκωλύει ξυνεῖναι ἐνίοις δ' ἐᾷ. As immediately before (in *Theaet.* 150c) we find the words τὸ δὲ αἴτιον τούτου τόδε· μαίνεσθαι με ὁ θεὸς ἀναγκάζει, γεννᾶν δὲ ἀπεκώλυσεν, it once more seems probable that *δαιμόνιον* is used as an alternative for *θεός*.

The word *δαιμόνιον* is also used adjectivally in Plato in regard to the

claims of Socrates to special divine intervention. The most notable passage is in the *Apology* 31 c-d: 'Ἴσως ἂν οὖν δόξειεν ἄτοπον εἶναι, ὅτι δὴ ἐγὼ ἰδίᾳ μὲν ταῦτα ξυμβουλευῶ περιῶν καὶ πολυπραγμονῶ δημοσίᾳ δὲ οὐ τολμῶ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὸ πλῆθος τὸ ὑμέτερον ξυμβουλευεῖν τῇ πόλει. τούτου δὲ αἴτιον ἔστιν ὃ ὑμεῖς ἐμοὶ πολλάκις ἀκηκόατε πολλάχου λέγοντος, ὅτι μοι θεῖόν τι καὶ δαιμόνιον γίγνεται φωνή, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ γραφῇ ἐπικωμῶδων Μέλητος ἐγράψατο. Here *δαιμόνιον* is clearly used as an adjective; but here also the word is used in direct juxtaposition to *θεῖον*, which would seem to show that just as in Plato τὸ δαιμόνιον is an alternative expression for *θεός*, so also the adjective *δαιμόνιον* is equivalent to *θεῖον*.

The word is also used as an adjective in *Alcib.* I. 103a: τούτου δὲ τὸ αἴτιον γέγονεν οὐκ ἀνθρώπειον, ἀλλὰ τι δαιμόνιον ἐναντίωμα (where *δαιμόνιον* clearly means 'divine' in contrast to 'human'); in *Euthyd.* 272e: ἀνισταμένου δέ μου ἐγένετο τὸ εἰωθὸς σημεῖον τὸ δαιμόνιον. πάλιν οὖν ἐκαθεζόμην; in *Phdr.* 242b: τὸ δαιμόνιον τε καὶ τὸ εἰωθὸς σημεῖόν μοι γίγρεσθαι ἐγένετο; and in *Rep.* 496c: τὸ δ' ἡμέτερον οὐκ ἄξιον λέγειν, τὸ δαιμόνιον σημεῖον. In all these passages it seems clear that the adjective is equivalent to the English 'divine'; just as the word, when used as a substantive, whether in Plato or Xenophon, is best translated by the English 'deity' or 'divinity'.

Lastly, the word 'δαίμων' is only used by Plato in connection with this phenomenon in the *Apology* 27b-e. Its use there is purely philological. Socrates begins by asking the question: 'Ἔστιν ὅστις ἀνθρώπων, ὃ Μέλητε, ἀνθρώπεια μὲν νομίζει πράγματ' εἶναι, ἀνθρώπους δὲ οὐ νομίζει; which Meletus is unable to deny. He then goes on to ask: ἔσθ' ὅστις δαιμόνια μὲν νομίζει πράγματ' εἶναι, δαίμονας δὲ οὐ νομίζει; which Meletus is equally unable to deny. He continues: εἰ δὲ δαιμόνια νομίζω, καὶ δαίμονας δήπου πολλὴ ἀνάγκη νομίζειν μέεσθιν, and thus proves triumphantly, by an argument which is based on etymology, that Meletus has falsely accused him of atheism. But it is clear that the word *δαίμων* is used in this passage solely because it happens

to be the original substantival form from which the adjective *δαιμόνιος* is derived, and for no other reason.

It is submitted, therefore, that the word *δαιμόνιον* when used in connection with Socrates' claim: (1) when used substantivally should be translated by the English word 'deity' (or 'divinity'); (2) when used adjectivally should be

translated by the adjective 'divine'; (3) clearly has not the same meaning as the word '*δαίμων*,' but was almost certainly the actual word used by Socrates himself in regard to the manifestations of a deity, of the exact nature of whom he was himself ignorant.

R. E. MACNAGHTEN.

29, Greycoat Gardens, Westminster.

ON SAPPHO'S ODE.

THE new ode of Sappho, published in No. X. of the Oxyrhyncus Papyri, and re-edited with interesting comments and emendations by Mr. J. M. Edmonds in the recent issue of the *Classical Review*, is unfortunately seriously defective owing to the condition of the papyrus, and it seems extremely improbable that any conjectural restoration can be successful in reproducing what the scribe wrote with any tolerable certainty. In one place the accuracy of the scribe himself may, I think, be challenged. In l. 6 the editors read:

ἂ γὰρ πόλυ περσκόπεισα
κάλλος ἀνθρώπων Ἑλένα.

They add that '*σκεδοῖσα* has led to no satisfactory restoration.' But they seem to admit, and it is quite obvious, that *περσκόπεισα* itself cannot be accepted without serious misgiving. That Helen should be credited by the poetess with a large experience of manly beauty is almost beyond belief. Not only is the remark in questionable taste, in fact on the verge of banality; but even if Helen's correct judgment upon that qualification had been the point at issue, Paris was no Aesop, and could have stood the test well enough. Yet it must be admitted that the papyrus supports *περσκόπεισα* and nothing else. ΠΕΡΣΚ is there beyond question. We have the assurance of photography. Did then the writer of the P. transmit an erroneous reading? This is possible and, I think, probable. At any rate, adopting this view, I suggest that Sappho herself in Fragment 93 *πέρροχος* affords us the means of restoring here the true sense:

ἂ γὰρ πόλυ περρόχευσα
κάλλος ἀνθρώπων.

'For she who far surpassed mortal beauty, Helen.' This has been for some 3,000 years, from Homer down to Andrew Lang and Rudyard Kipling, the universal idea of Helen, and surely Sappho expresses it in this phrase as finely as any poet, either before or since. Let us see how Shakespeare has paid tribute to an ideal lady:

Then to Sylvia let us sing,
That Sylvia is excelling;
She excels each mortal thing
Upon the dull earth dwelling.

Here we have nearly the same phrasing as that I assign to Sappho, and a curiously close reproduction of the *ἐπὶ γὰρ μέλαιναν* in l. 2.

In l. 8 *νεῖμεν* seems better than *κρίνεν*. It is not so much a question of judgment as of sentiment.

L. 9: Possibly *τάχος* for *τὸ πᾶν*, marking that the destruction was in the near future, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 944, *Eumen.* 124.

L. 11: *οὐποτ' ἐμνάσθη* is perhaps better. *Μᾶλλον* seems scarcely admissible here. The meaning it gives: 'She had no better memory of,' 'there was no improvement in her recollection of,' will not serve.

L. 12: There are wide possibilities of conjecture here. I suggest

οὐκι κατ' αἶσαν (οὐ τι).

L. 13:

ἽΩρος· εὐκαμπτον γὰρ ἔφυσεν ἄτορ,
αἶ' κέ τις κούφως τὸ νέον νοήσῃ·
τῷ δὲ νῦν Ἀνακτορίας τὸ μέμνα
οὐ παρεοίσας·

or γὰρ ἔχει φρόναμα. Τῷ δὲ κ.τ.λ. 'So therefore do thou remember,' *μέμνασο*.

L. 20: Perhaps *στησιμάχοντας*. Apparently a review of troops is meant; but

both horse and foot would play a part in this. The preceding ἄρματα might refer to fashionable spectators. Herodotus mentions Lydian cavalry, but not war-chariots.

I suggest for the last stanza :

εὖ δὲ Φίδμεν οὐ δύνατον γέεσθαι
 ὄλβον ἀνθρώποις· πεδέχην δ' ἄρασθαι
 ἔλπιδ' ἐς φαίδραν ἄγαγ' ὠφέλησεν
 τ' ἐξ ἄδοκῆτω.

Cf. Hom. Od. iii. 208 :

ἀλλ' οὐ μοι τοιοῦτον ἐπέκλωσαν θεοὶ
 ὄλβον.

P.S.—I see that Dr. A. S. Hunt, writing in the June issue on the possible readings of the papyrus, objects to Mr. Edmonds's οὐδέ in l. 15 because 'δ is quite improbable.' Obviously my

τῷ δέ is open to the same objection. May I suggest as not inconsistent with the appearances on the papyrus?

ἀλλὰ νῦν Ἀνακτορίας τὸ μέμνα-
 σ' οὐ παρείσας.

In l. 14 the objection to τις is perhaps not quite so well founded. There is little decisive guidance.

Marks of an indefinite hiatus should probably be placed before the concluding stanza.

L. 19 f. The words of Cowley, 'the spectators made up—no small part of the spectacle itself,' in his description of the funeral of Oliver Cromwell, convey the same idea.

T. L. AGAR.

11, Clyde Road, West Didsbury, Manchester.

THE BRIGHT ALDEBARAN.

DANIEL BOONE, or any squirrel hunter of Kentucky, could doubtless have solved the difficulties of Euripides, I. A. 7-8, for the philologists, even if he were so untutored as to be unable to call the star by name, for he would be able at least to point out the σείριος ἄστὴρ near the Pleiades. And he would also know what the philologists (usually snug in bed at this time) do not seem to have known—that hours, apparently, elapse from the time the hunter begins his watch until the glorious orb of day rises above the horizon. No sound of birds is yet heard; no squirrel comes leaping over the branches of the forest to the feeding tree. The gloom of darkness prevails on earth; but the first streak of dawn has appeared in the east, and the sky gradually becomes brighter. Soon the lesser lights, and the constellation of the Pleiades itself, are extinguished. The σείριος Aldebaran alone remains twinkling in this part of the heavens. It is just at this time that Agamemnon emerges from his tent in haste. Nearly ten minutes later the fire of Helios begins to burn, and changes the azure of the sky to white: λευκαίνει | τότε φῶς ἤδη λάμπουσ' ἡὼς | πῦρ τε τεθρίππων τῶν Ἀελίου (156-58). 'This light' is not the torch in Aga-

memnon's hand, as some think, but the light in the sky (τόδε φῶς in contradistinction to the σκότος which still remains on earth); and this light has obscured almost all the stars. Now if the sky, as seen from the eastern edge of a woodland pasture in Kentucky, is lit up so long before the sun appears, how much longer must the heaven have been bright at Aulis before the sun showed his face above Mount Olympus in Euboea? Yet only a few minutes pass before Agamemnon observes that the chariot of the sun is making its appearance. A glimpse of the famous morning scene in *Chantecler* would correct any false impressions one might have concerning the approach of ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως.

Hermann thinks 'verba ἔτι μεσσήρης non ita premenda videri,' and Klotz adds 'ne illa quidem verba ἐγγὺς . . . Πλειάδος premenda videri.' But it is certainly extremely unlikely that an intelligent and educated Greek, who gazed at the stars ἐν αἰθέρος κύκλῳ much more frequently than those who are accustomed to gaze rather at the stars ἐν κύκλῳ δολλαρίου, could have made such a blunder as to transfer Sirius from the eastern sky to the zenith near the Pleiades. Even more improb-

able is the assumption of Boeckh (and many others) that Sirius is on the western horizon. And Klotz's own interpretation (*mediam noctem esse*) seems to me to be the most unlikely of all.

It has been assumed by scholars that both the Dog Star and the Pleiades are visible. My contention is that neither is visible. Commentators do not seem to have attached sufficient importance to *ποτ' ἄρ' and to πορθμεύει*. To ask *τίς ποτ' ἄρ' ἀστήρ ὅδε* were a silly question, if the star were easy, under the circumstances, to locate, that is, in its relation to the other stars. If Agamemnon saw Sirius, when all the other stars were shining, he recognized it; and it would have been unnecessary for another to explain to him *ἔγγυς τῆς Πλειάδος*—which after all is not true, so far as the Dog Star is concerned. And *πορθμεύει* evidently refers to some bright bark crossing the ferry of the empyrean sea. 'The dawn in russet mantle clad walks o'er the dew of yon high eastern hill' (159). But the bright star which has attracted Agamemnon's gaze is still twinkling (*ἄσσων ἔτι μεσσηρης*). The light of the morn has dimmed all the other candles in the sky. Hence Agamemnon is unable to determine precisely which one this particular *ἀστήρ* is, that still palpitates in broad daylight. The old man knows, because he has been observing the sky for some time. But the commander-in-chief has just come from his tent, and in great haste (*αἴσσεις*, 11). The Pleiades are no longer visible. As he looks toward the east and then lifts his eyes toward the zenith, his attention is naturally

attracted to the *αἴσσων* Aldebaran (the tents certainly faced the Euripus): no sound of birds is heard—*οὔτε θαλάσσης*—and no sign of winds, for which the Greeks have looked in vain so long, appears on the Euripus. The deictic *τόνδε* indicates that Agamemnon is looking in the direction of Euboea. The form *αἴσσων* of our MSS. is possibly due to *αἴσσεις* just below.

There can be no question but that the Greeks used *σεῖριος* to designate any bright star, cf. Theon Smyrn. *De astron.* 16, *κοινῶς τε γάρ, φησὶν ὁ Ἀδραστος, πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας οἱ ποιηταὶ σεῖριους καλοῦσιν*. If, now, the poet refers to Aldebaran as 'a *σεῖριος* ἔγγυς τῆς Πλειάδος,' Hermann's *ἐξῆς* for *ἔγγυς*, Musgrave's *Πτωκάδος* for *Πλειάδος*, Vater's *αἴσων* for *ἄσσων*, and Weil's *Αἴθων*, are all unnecessary.

The participle *ἄσσων* refers to the throbbing of the star. Cf. Plato, *Symposium* 215 E *ἡ καρδία πηδᾷ*, Eur. *Hipp.* 1353 *πηδᾷ σφάκελος*, Bacch. 1289 *καρδία πηδῆμι ἔχει*, Plut. 2.83 B, Hippoc. 1221 B *πηδῆθμός* (*pulsation*), Theophr. *Ign.* 69 *πηδῆσις* (of wood burning). The throbbing veins were called *τὰ σφύζοντα* (Plato, *Phaedr.* 251 D); and *ἄσσων* is here equivalent to *σφύζων*.

Aldebaran goes *μεσοπόρου δι' αἰθέρος* (*Ion* 1152) along the *ἑπταπόρου δρόμημα* *Πελειάδος* (*Or.* 1005). It is one of the conspicuous *ἀστρ' ἐν αἰθέρος κύκλῳ* (*Ion* 1147), in *altisono Caeli clipeo*, and Agamemnon is simply wondering *τίς ἀστήρ ἄσσων ἔτι μεσσηρης*, in spite of the fact that the whole vault of heaven toward the east is 'whitened' with the light of the approaching sun.

J. E. HARRY.

University of Cincinnati.

DR. J. B. MAYOR ON THE USE OF ENI AND ENEΣΤΙ, AND AITEIN AND AITEΙΣΘΑΙ, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

DR. J. B. MAYOR discusses these points in the *Expositor* for April 1912 p. 380 *sqq.*, and June 1912 p. 522 *sqq.* In Galatians iii. 26-28 *οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἕλλην . . . πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἔστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, he explains (differing from Lightfoot, who comments, there is no room for, no place for') thus:

'In the body of Christ distinctions disappear: Jew is not, Greek is not.' 'What more is needed? If we will go out of our way to introduce the idea of impossibility, we must change the personal to the impersonal construction: *οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ εἶναι οὐδὲ Ἕλληνα τὸν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. So 1 Cor. vi. 5,

οὕτως οὐκ ἔνι ἐν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς σοφός; In James i. 17 παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἔνι παραλλαγή, ἔνι is to be taken in the same way. In the following places ἐνεστί has the literal meaning: Thuc. I. 80, ἐνεσται χρόνος, not 'time will be necessary,' but 'there will be an interval of time' (admitted by Sheppard and Evans and apparently Classen); Plato, *Phaedo* 77E, ἴσως ἔνι τις καὶ ἐν ἡμῶν παῖς (where Dr. Hort has seen 'a playful irony': 'perhaps it is not impossible that'; but where Themistius, *Or.* I. 13, takes the literal sense); Soph. *El.* 527, τῶνδ' ἄρνησις οὐκ ἐνεστί μοι, et alibi. The view taken in these passages appears sound.

But the conclusions about the use of αἰτεῖν and αἰτεῖσθαι are more disputable.

He discusses James iv. 2, 3, οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε. Refuting Dr. Hort (who on this passage says that αἰτεῖν is properly to ask a person, what is asked for being often added in a second accusative; and that αἰτεῖσθαι is properly to ask for a thing; the person asked is sometimes also inserted, but rarely), Dr. Mayor points out that this distinction is not in accordance either with the usage of N.T. (Luke i. 63 αἰτήσας πινακίδιον, Acts xvi. 29 αἰτήσας φῶτα) or of profane Greek; it is counter to the dictum of Favorinus ap. Sturz, *Lexic. Xenoph.* s.v. αἰτοῦμαι τὸ μετὰ παρακλήσεως αἰτῶ καὶ ἰκετεύω, and to Schol. on Ar. *Plut.* 156, αἰτῶ τὸ ἀπλῶς ζητῶ, τὸ δὲ αἰτοῦμαι τὸ μεθ' ἰκεσίας.

But he proceeds to argue that in this passage of St. James αἰτῶ means 'prayer of the lips, as contrasted with prayer of the heart' (αἰτεῖσθαι); he illustrates it by Mark vi. 22, 25. 'Herod's thoughtless promise to the daughter of Herodias is expressed by the words αἰτησὼν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς; but the daughter of Herodias consults her mother v. 24 τί αἰτήσωμαι; and v. 25 εἰσελθοῦσα εὐθύς μετὰ σπουδῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ᾗτήσατο.' So in Matthew xx. 20-22 = Mark x. 35-38 Salome requests for her sons, αἰτούσά τι παρ' αὐτοῦ, but Christ replies, οὐκ οἶδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε, giving the true meaning of the request.

But the force of the instance in Mark vi. is weakened by the parallel Matthew xiv. 7, where Herod ὠμολό-

γησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ἃ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃται, and conversely, though Mark xi. 24 ὅσα ἂν προσευχόμενοι αἰτεῖσθε may be advanced by him, = Matthew xxi. 22 has ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ πιστεύοντες, where the heart is implied: though Dr. M. might say that πιστ. makes the middle unnecessary.

Again, he argues thus. John xvi. 24, 26 has ᾗτήσατε οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου (the prayers of the disciples before the outpouring of the Spirit), but ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου αἰτήσεσθε (the prayers which should follow the outpouring). 1 John v. 14, ἐάν τι αἰτῶμεθα κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ἀκούει ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐὰν οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀκούει ἡμῶν ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεθα, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἔχομεν τὰ αἰτήματα ἃ ᾗτήκαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. 'The general sense seems to be, "If we pray in spirit and in truth according to His will, we know that we have the object of our petitions."'

But does the general usage in St. John bear this out? Surely the following passages in which the active is used imply prayer of the heart: John xiv. 13 ὃ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, xv. 16 ὃ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, xvi. 23 ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, 1 John iii. 22 ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν λαμβάνομεν παρ' αὐτοῦ. And αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται Matthew vii. 7 (the active five times in this passage, and five times in = Luke xi. 9).

In fact, the meanings of the active and middle appear to be identical, and no certain conclusions can be drawn from the instances in the LXX. Further, the Indexes to the classical prose and verse writers point, as often in the case of constructions, rather to a historical change of usage than to a difference in meaning. Thus in Aeschylus the middle preponderates over the active, and to some extent in Sophocles; in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Euripides the instances are about equal; in Aristophanes in the more dignified passages the middle predominates; in Lysias and Andocides the middle, but in the later Attic of Plato and Demosthenes, the active: in Xenophon they are about equal. In set phrases, such as δίκας, λόγον, μισθόν (Hdt. Plat.), the active is used, just as with St. John's

ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι; but with adjectives and pronouns, the middle. Lastly, the Rev. L. Pullan points out to me that St. Luke in the Acts prefers the middle, and apparently in part of his Gospel (ch. xxiii.); but in the middle

section of his Gospel, which is largely based upon another document, the active. Beyond this it does not seem safe to go.

J. U. POWELL.

PORTUS ITIUS.¹

I HAVE been abroad for eight weeks. Returning to London towards the end of June, I saw for the first time F. H.'s second article. My object is not to make points against him, but to throw more light upon the question.

1. Whatever F. H. thinks of the evidence adduced by Desbrière, he will admit that Napoleon's officers were never able to get more than 100 ships out of Boulogne Harbour in one tide, that except in the narrow space formed by the channel of the Liane the ships were generally aground, and that not only lack of room but also the force of the tidal current was a serious obstacle.² F. H. says that 'in any case this evidence yields only probabilities.' I never contended that it yielded more. But since Caesar had to get at least 600-650 ships out of Portus Itius, not merely in one tide but in two hours or less, or else to start from the roadstead outside the harbour, the probabilities can hardly be ignored.

2. F. H. affirms that 'no ground exists for alleging that the other 150 or 200 trading ships'—the ships which *sui quisque commodi causa fecerat*—'all started from . . . any particular spot.' It seems to me that two grounds exist for supposing that they started from Portus Itius. First, if they started from any other port, they and their owners needed special protection; and since Caesar allowed the owners to accompany him, if he had forbidden them to start from Portus Itius, he would surely have detached troops to protect them. Secondly, the 'trading ships,' the transports, and the galleys were all visible off the British

coast at the same time.³ Is it not probable that they all started from the same port? At all events no ground exists for alleging that the 'trading ships' started from a port other than Portus Itius. Nevertheless, I will make F. H. a present of them.

3. The 'nautical opinion' did not mean 'that the ships could be got out with a depth and extent of water which might reasonably be assumed': it meant that they might have been got out with the depth and extent of water which Desjardins postulated. Desjardins's plan⁴ represents the mouth of the harbour as about 530 yards wide. Probably it was; but one may doubt whether at the time when the ships began to move—about four hours before high water⁵—it was deep enough near the sides to float them.⁶ The sides of estuaries which have not been artificially improved are dry at low water. The 'nautical opinion' was based on the hypothesis that the ships did not start from the wharves, but that, after leaving the wharves, they were anchored in parallel rows in the estuary, and were ready *ad solis occasum*

³ *B.G.*, v. 8, 6.

⁴ *Géogr. de la Gaule rom.*, vol. i., pl. xv. and xvii.

⁵ *Ancient Britain*, pp. 729-30. In *Ancient Britain* (p. 576, n. 1) I was obliged to assume that *ad solis occasum* meant about 7 p.m.,—an hour before sunset; otherwise there would hardly have been time for the ships to get from Boulogne to the point which they reached at dawn. The assumption was, I think, permissible; if not, the case for Boulogne is weakened.

⁶ In the Bronze Age the bed of the estuary in the 'ancien bassin,' which in the Stone Age had been considerably deeper, was 8 m. 24 (about 27 feet) below the level of high water at spring tides. See *Boulogne-sur-mer et la région boulonnaise*, i., 1899, pp. 23-4, and cf. Desjardins, i. 380. But at Boulogne the range of spring tides is 25½ feet (*The Channel Pilot*, Part II., 1906, p. 559).

¹ *Classical Review*, December, 1913; March and May, 1914.

² E. Desbrière, *Projets et tentatives*, etc., iii. 144, 147-8, 451, 566; iv. 145, 395, 398.

to start in the order which would have enabled the rowers to clear the harbour in the shortest possible time. To assume that when they were about to start they were at anchor strains the words *naves soluit*. It is permissible to suppose that the ships started from the wharves, where the troops had embarked, close to the camp. Of the whole fleet about 540 transports and 28 galleys could be rowed.¹ If they had been drawn up in single file, 570, placed end to end in actual contact, would have formed a line nearly 7 miles long.² Therefore, if Portus Itius was Boulogne, we must suppose that they were massed, like Napoleon's ships, alongside the wharves in contiguous rows, say eight or nine deep;³ or, if there were two camps, one on either side of the harbour, four or five deep. The harbour-master of Dover believes that they could not have been rowed out against the tide at the rate of more than two miles an hour.⁴ I have calculated that with perfect organization and supposing that the rowers had worked with machine-like precision, that the current had not interfered with steering, and that there was room for ten ships to move out abreast, the ships might have cleared the harbour in four hours, or, if they started simultaneously from wharves on either side, in two.⁵ Perhaps, if they had been formed side by side perpendicularly to the wharves, the time might have been reduced; but I am not sure that in this case they would not have been unduly crowded.

¹ *B.G.*, v. 2, 2; 5, 2.

² The transports could hardly have been smaller than Napoleon's smallest vessels, which were 60 feet long. See *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, p. 436, n. 6, and *B.G.*, v. 23, 5.

³ See the plan in Desbrière's fourth vol., p. 400.

⁴ So he told me in 1911.

⁵ The best plan would have been this. Suppose that the ships in the column furthest from the wharf, reckoned from the ship nearest the mouth of the harbour, were numbered 1, 2, 3. . . . The crews of 10, 20, 30, etc., would have simultaneously cast off the hawsers, and begun to row diagonally across the stream. At the right moment 9, 19, 29, etc., would have followed suit. Thus ultimately 10, 9, 8. . . 1 would have been rowing abreast, followed by 20, 19, 18, etc. Then the next column would have begun to move, and so on. Remember that the current was of course strongest in mid-

stream, and that there are eddies at the mouth of the harbour.
⁶ *B.G.*, v. 1, 1.
⁷ Probably after; for their draught was greater, and when the transports had gone there would have been more water.
⁸ Cf. *B.G.*, iv. 23, 2 with § 4.
⁹ Desbrière, iii. 144.
¹⁰ See *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, 1911, pp. 436, 438.

But the ships that could be rowed were not the whole fleet. Neither the 'nautical opinion' nor the calculation which I have just mentioned took account of the larger ships which Caesar had used in the previous year. Most of these ships, however, were used again in 54 B.C.⁶ They could not have cleared the harbour along with the others: they must have started either before or after;⁷ and, if they had started from the wharves, to get them out under sail would have taken a long time. The small fleet—eighty transports and a few galleys—which sailed from Boulogne in 55 B.C. was inconveniently strung out.⁸ If the whole fleet started in the order required by the 'nautical opinion,' it may have cleared the estuary in two hours; but one must not forget what Napoleon's harbour-master said about the tide: 'La vitesse est telle pendant près de deux heures dans les grandes marées, que l'art et la précaution de la manœuvre ne peuvent en triompher.'⁹ It is true that the period during which the tide flowed at this speed did not begin till about two hours and a half before high water; but while it lasted Napoleon's officers could not get their ships out at all. Some may be inclined to suppose that Caesar's ships, having cleared the harbour in the course of the day, started *ad solis occasum* from the roadstead; but this assumption also strains the meaning of *naves soluit*. Perhaps the words will bear the strain;¹⁰ but the difficulty must be faced.

4. I of course admit that, as F. H. says, 'it is doubtful whether' the Earl of Leicester 'originally sailed from Wissant with a very large force.'

5. F. H. says that 'on any ordinary calculation the supply [of water] mentioned by Mr. Holmes would not have sufficed for the animals alone, even if—as is impossible—not a drop had been

stream, and that there are eddies at the mouth of the harbour.

⁶ *B.G.*, v. 1, 1.

⁷ Probably after; for their draught was greater, and when the transports had gone there would have been more water.

⁸ Cf. *B.G.*, iv. 23, 2 with § 4.

⁹ Desbrière, iii. 144.

¹⁰ See *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, 1911, pp. 436, 438.

wasted.' In the Crimean War 'every gallon of water that the spring gave was made available.' If F. H. will consult *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*,¹ he will see how simple was the well-known contrivance by which this result was attained. He will be quite safe if he accepts the calculation of Lord Wolseley,—that a horse 'requires from six to eight gallons per diem' and a mule six gallons.² Besides the 4,000 cavalry horses, there were, according to the usual estimate, 4,000-4,800 beasts of burden, and, let us say, 1,000 cavalry remounts. I will suppose that 10,000 horses and mules had to be provided for. They would have required 60,000 gallons a day. My informant, speaking with authority, stated that there were 'entr'autres trois sources extrêmement abondantes.' He gave the daily yield of two of the three,—80,000 + 200,000-300,000 litres. Taking the mean between the two latter figures, we get a total of 330,000 litres, or 73,260 gallons. This would have provided for the animals and have left for the men about 13,000 gallons, *plus* the supply yielded by the other springs, one of which is 'extrêmement abondante.' F. H. reckons that there were 39,000 men to be provided for, besides the crews and 'a miscellaneous host of camp-followers,' whose numbers he will not conjecture. The crews, except those of the twenty-eight galleys, did not include rowers; for the transports were rowed by soldiers.³ Let us suppose that the crews numbered 3,000.⁴ The 'camp-followers' were the *mercatores*, who followed the army in order to trade with it, and were not allowed to sleep inside the camp, and the *calones*,—slaves who performed menial duties and drivers. We may be sure that Caesar kept the number of the former within bounds, and that of the latter he employed no more than were necessary. I can discover only one indication of their relative numbers under the Republic. It will be found in *Bell. Civ.*, iii. 2, 2, compared with 6, 1-2. In the former passage Caesar says that

when he reached Brundisium in the autumn of 49 B.C. he found only enough ships to carry 15,000 legionaries and 600 cavalry. In 6, 1-2 he says that he urged the men, who cheerfully consented, to leave behind the slaves and heavy baggage (*mancipia atque impedimenta*), in order to provide room for more troops, and that he sailed with seven legions [and 600 cavalry]. The seven legions amounted, as Stoffel⁵ calculates, to about 20,000 men. We may infer that the slaves and baggage—that is, all the baggage that could be dispensed with—of 15,000 legionaries and 600 cavalry took up as much room as 5,000 legionaries. The *impedimenta* presumably included the beasts that would have carried the superfluous baggage. The slaves therefore evidently numbered less than 5,000; and if I assume that there were 12,000 'camp-followers' at Portus Itius, I shall perhaps be making an excessive estimate. In the field every man requires six pints of water a day for drinking and cooking, and, as Lord Wolseley says, 'a similar amount will just allow men to wash their bodies.'⁶ Thus 54,000 men would have required 81,000 gallons. Though the third 'abundant' spring and the others would probably not have supplied the needful amount, there were other sources,—the river Slacq, which was not more than four miles from any spot where the army would have encamped near Wissant, and its tributary, the Bazinghen, which was rather nearer. The animals needed exercise and could well have been taken thither to water, leaving the springs for the men.⁷ 'It is a good plan,' says Lord Wolseley, 'to water when about one or two miles from camp, and then to walk the horses slowly to their lines for the night: always give lake or river water [to animals] in preference to that from springs or wells.'⁸ Even at Boulogne it would have been necessary to go some miles up the Liane for fresh water, un-

¹ Fifth ed., 1886, p. 258.

² *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*, 1886, pp. 73, 77.

³ *B.G.*, v. 8, 4.

⁴ The author of the 'nautical opinion' owns a ketch, 57 feet long, which he sails with the help of two men.

⁵ *Hist. de Jules César*, ii. 323.

⁶ *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*, p. 95.

⁷ At Alexandria Caesar sunk wells with satisfactory results (*Bell. Alex.*, 8, 1; 9, 1-2); but to do so at Wissant would have been unnecessary.

⁸ *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*, p. 73.

less springs yielded enough, for in the estuary the water was of course brackish.

F. H. tells me that I 'observed (*Ancient Britain*, p. 583) that Caesar's forces could not possibly have been fed at Wissant.' Neither on p. 583 nor anywhere else. What I said (on p. 584) was that 'to transport [food] to Wissant without roads would have been a task of extreme difficulty,'—for wagons. As I did not then realise that Caesar may have thought it advisable to discard Boulogne in 54 B.C., lest he should be unable to clear the estuary in a reasonable time, I naturally argued that he would have preferred the port which was connected with the interior by roads to one which, as far as we know, was not. But, if he desired to avoid the difficulties of extricating his huge fleet from the estuary, it was not difficult to transport grain to Wissant on pack-horses; and, as I now know, if the ground is firm, even wagons can be drawn by oxen where there are no roads.¹ It must not be forgotten that Caesar did not intend to stay long at Portus Itius: the north-westerly winds which delayed him for twenty-five days were unexpected and unusual.

I have only tried to show that the case for Boulogne cannot be regarded as conclusively proved. There is reason, I repeat, to believe that between Cape Griz-Nez and Cape Blanc-Nez the ships

which were constructed with a view to their being easily hauled up on shore could have remained above the high-water mark of spring tides, while the older vessels might have ridden in the anchorage which is protected against northerly and north-westerly winds by a sandbank, and against south-westerly winds, to some extent, by Cape Griz-Nez;² it was possible to feed the troops; and there was enough water. I think therefore that F. H. exaggerates when he says that 'the evidence is dead against Wissant'; and I hope to convince him that the weakness, or the element of doubt, which I have discovered in the case for Boulogne is not imaginary.

T. RICE HOLMES.

[By the courtesy of the editors I have seen a proof of the above. Plainly, the controversy, if it is not to swallow the whole *Classical Review*, must stop here, before its multitudes of 'ifs' get thicker. I will say only, as to water at Wissant, that I took expert military counsel before I wrote, and that Mr. Holmes seems to have minimised his men and beasts and their needs beyond due measure, and yet not to have enough water. For the rest, I must console myself that, if I am not on the same side as Mr. Holmes, I am on the side of M. Jullian.—F. H.]

² Cf. Desbrière, iii. 162, with *Geol. Mag.*, 1866, pp. 113-4.

¹ *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*, p. 78.

NOTES

PISIDIAN STELAE.

[NOTE.—Professor Sayce sent me the following notes in the winter of 1905-6; but the paper was lost among numbers of similar unfinished articles of much greater length, and I found it again only in the end of February, 1914. The inscriptions present several points of interest, on which the notes are partly Professor Sayce's and partly mine.—W. M. RAMSAY.]

In the spring of 1905 I copied some interesting inscriptions on stelae from

Pisidia and Lycia, which are in the Museum at Constantinople. They were unnumbered, and, so far as I can learn, are still unpublished. The letters are painted under figures of warriors in Greek dress, which are also painted on the stone.

I.

ΠΙΝΑΡΕΩΝ ΤΟ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΤΜΑ
ΚΑΡΤΑΔΙΝΕΡΜΑ ΚΤΙΒΙΛΟΤ
ΜΝΙΟΝ ΧΡΗΣΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΛΤΠΙΕΧΑΙΡΕ

Πινάρεων τὸ πολίτευμα,
Καρταδινερμα Κτιβίλου
μν[ε]ῖον· χρηστὲ καὶ ἄλυπε, χαῖρε.

'The governing body of Pinara: a memorial to Kartadinermas, son of Ktibilos: farewell in painless happiness!'

My division of the two proper names is of course conjectural; but both must be genitive (or the first dative).

With Ktibilos compare Kutbelemis, and Ktouboldos (Sundwall, *die einheim. Namen der Lykier*, p. 117; also the Isaurian name $\chi\upsilon\tau$ in an unpublished inscription).

Πολίτευμα is noteworthy here: the sense is unusual. In the great inscription of Rhodiapolis (Benndorf-Niemann, II. pp. 80-115), πολίτευμα is used twice in the sense, 'performance of the duties of a citizen.' So also in the Tarsian Paul's letter to the Philippians, II. 20. Here it seems to denote 'the body of the πολίται,' i.e. the assembly.

2.

ΣΑΛΜΑΜΟ . . . ΔΑΔΕ . . .

Σ[?]αλμαμό[ας] Ἀ[δ]αδέ[υς].
[χαίρει.]

'Salmamoas of Adada, farewell!'

The element -μαμο is common in Pisidian names—Μαμόας, Μαμότασις, Μάμαστις, etc. Salma + Moas is probably the best way of dividing the name into elements.

3.

ΔΙΟΣΚΤΡΙΔΗΕΞΑΒΟΟΤ ΠΙΣΙΔΗ
ΒΑΡΒΟΤΑΕΤΣΤΜΜΑΧΩΝ
ΣΗΜΕΟΦΟΡΕΧΡΗΣΤΕ
ΧΑΙΡΕ
ΚΕΡΑΙΑΣ Ο ΑΔΕΛΦΟΣ ΕΣΤΗΣΕ

Διοσκ[ο]υρίδης ἐξ Ἀβόου Πισιδῆ
Βαρβουλεῦ συμμάχων
σημε[ι]οφόρε, χρηστὲ
χαίρει.

Κεραίας ὁ ἀδελφός ἔστησε.

'O Dioskourides, standard-bearer of the auxiliaries, from Aboos Pisidian of Barboula, farewell in happiness! His brother Keraias has erected (this).'

Balbours was one of the cities of the Cibyratic Tetrapolis. The transposition of ν and λ is in accordance with many examples. σύμμαχοι are to be understood as mercenary soldiers serving

under a foreign flag. Old Lycian soldiers formed part of the population of the Seleucid city Apollonia, in Pisidian Phrygia (Pisidia later). Aboos was perhaps a village of the territory of Balbours: compare Abokome Lycaniae and the personal name Aba.

With the personal name Κεραίας we must connect the ethnic Κεραειτῶν, a people united on coins with the people of Cremna. Compare the town-name Kadooi, Κάδοι, ethnic Καδοηνός (*Hist. Geogr.*), Kidramoas and Kidramos, Pappas and Pappa, etc.

4.

ΣΑΕΤΤΑΣ ΤΡΟΚΟΝΔΟΤΤΕΡΜΗΣ
ΣΕΟΝΤΟΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΟΙΝΟΑΝΔΟΙΣ
ΠΙΔΗΣ ΣΤΜΜΑΧΟΣ ΤΕΡΜΗΣΣΕΩ
ΝΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΟΙΝΟΑΝΔΟΙΣ ΠΙΣΙΔΩΝ
ΤΟ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΜΑ ΤΟΝ ΕΑΥΤΩΝ ΠΟΛΕ
ΙΤΗΝ ΧΡΗΣΤΕ ΧΑΙΡΕ

Σαέττας Τροκόνδου Τερμησ
σέ[ω]ν τ[ώ]ν πρὸς Ὀινοάνδους
Πι[σι]δῆς σύμμαχος Τερμησσεώ
ν τῶν πρὸς Ὀινοάνδους Πισιδῶν,
τό πολίτευμα τὸν εαυτῶν πολε
ίτην· χρηστὲ, χαίρει.

'Saettas, son of Trokondas, auxiliary, of the Termessians near Oenoanda, a Pisidian: the governing body of Termessos near Oenoanda, Pisidians, to their citizen: happy one, farewell!'

Trokondas, contracted probably from Trokondēmos, is a well known South-Asianic name, compounded with that of the god Tarkus.

Saettas, compare the city-name Saittai of Lydia; see note above on Keraias.

A. H. SAYCE.

ΑΤΕΑΝΙΟΣ.

THIS word occurs in an interesting metrical inscription on a gladiator which Messrs. Ormerod and Robinson have just published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 34, p. 18 ('Inscriptions from Lycia,' No. 26). This gladiator, a *secutor* called Victor, ὃν πάντες τρέμεον σύνζυγοι ἐν σταδίοις (cf. Mart. V. 24. 4, 5 'Hermes turba sui tremorque ludi, | Hermes quem timet Helius sed unum'), was a native of

Libya who died in Lycia, in the words of the epitaph,

οὐ πατρίς ἦν Λιβύη νῦν δὲ Ξάνθοιό με
γαῖα,
αὐξάνιον δάπεδον, κατέ(χ)ει σὺν δόγματι
Μοιρ(ῶ)ν.

αὐξάνιον, which the editors give up, is a compound from αὐξί- *άνια*, like αὐξίβιος, αὐξίτροφος Orph. H. 9 (10). 17, 50 (51). 12, Αὐξιτύχη (a remodelled formation from an earlier ἀξί-, ἀξί-τροφος Orph. H. 50 (51). 17, ἀξίγνιος Pind., ἀξίκακος, ἀξίνοος, ἀξίτοκος, ἀξίφυλλος, etc.) on the one hand, and like Λυσ-άνιας cf. Ar. Nub. 1162 λυσάνιας πατρῶν μεγάλων κακῶν, Λυσ-αγόρας etc. by λυσι- πονος etc. on the other. The thought in *dolorem augens solum* hardly needs illustration; the

bitter lament of Catullus will no doubt occur to many, 68. 97 sqq. 'quem nunc tam longe non inter nota sepulcra | nec prope cognatos compositum cineres | sed Troia obscena, Troia infelice sepultum | detinet (κατέχει) extremo terra aliena solo.'

The editors are undoubtedly right in understanding σύζυγοι of the adversaries with whom Victor was drawn to fight. So *compares* in Lactantius *Inst.* VI. 20. 13 'irascuntur etiam pugnantibus nisi celeriter e duobus alter occisus est et, tamquam humanum sanguinem sitiant, oderunt moras; alios illis *compares* dari poscunt recentiores ut quam primum oculos suos satient.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool,
July 13, 1914.

REVIEWS

GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT.

De Magistratibus Aegyptiis externas Lagidarum Regni Provincias administrantibus. Scripsit D. COHEN. 8vo. Pp. xii + 114. 's Gravenhage: L. Levisson, n.d. Hfl. 4.50 (M. 8, Frs. 9.50).

Quaestiones Epiphanianae metrologicae et criticae. Scripsit OSCARIUS VIEDEBANTT. 8vo. Pp. x. + 140. 1 plate and tables. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 6.

Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer. Von DR. JUR. MARIANO SAN NICOLÒ. Ier Band. 8vo. Pp. 225. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913.

Der Fiskus der Ptolemaeer: I. Seine Spezialbeamten und sein öffentlich rechtlicher Charakter. Von. DR. JUR. ALFONS STEINER. 8vo. Pp. 66. Leipzig, Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913. Unbound, M. 2.40; bound, M. 3.60.

Ptolemäisches Prozessrecht: Studien zur ptolemäischen Gerichtsverfassung und zum Gerichtsverfahren. Heft I. Von DR. JUR. GREGOR SEMEKA. 8vo. Pp. v + 311. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913.

THE first of the above books relates not to Egypt itself, but to the Egyptian empire, and the second concerns papyrology incidentally only. Dr. Cohen's volume had its origin, as he explains in his preface, in a scheme for a history of the Roman province of Judaea. He considered it advisable first to determine the manner of its government in pre-Roman times; and since trustworthy material for the administrative history of Judaea itself is almost entirely wanting, his plan is to reach a conclusion by inference from the state of affairs in the other provinces of the Lagid and Seleucid empires. The present volume is devoted to the former. The literary material is, as he points out, of little use for the details of administration, owing to the vagueness of the phraseology employed by historians, and, with the exception of P. Tebt. I. 8, it is not here, as in the case of Egypt, supplemented by papyri. The evidence is therefore derived almost entirely from inscriptions, which are themselves not over numerous, and whose testimony is often ambiguous. The author traverses the ground very

carefully, and his collection of the evidence from many sources, with his detailed discussion, will be useful; but though he establishes some facts of importance, it must be confessed that as a whole the positive results are, necessarily, somewhat scanty. There is much discussion of the views of other scholars, his criticism of whom is often just; but at other times his arguments are far from convincing, and there is a tendency now and then to use a conjectural conclusion as an established basis for further conjectures. He prints on p. 57 ff. a complete re-edition of the papyrus mentioned above, into which he introduces a number of new readings. Some are happy, and one of his suggestions has been adopted by Wilcken in the text of the papyrus printed by him in his *Chrestomathie*; but several are too daring to be convincing. In particular his reading of $\tau\rho(i)\tau\eta\ \mu(o\acute{\iota})\rho\alpha$ and IZ in l. 5, and of Δ in l. 14 does not accord well with the facsimile. There is certainly writing there; but he appears to have overlooked the remark of the original editors that the papyrus contains some notes apparently unconnected with the main document, and the writing in l. 5 is one of these. Mr. Johnson kindly informs me that the papyrus is now packed up, and not easily accessible, but that in the original transcript the writing in question is noted as being in inverse order to the main document, and is read as $\text{Ζηνω} \mid \lambda\iota\beta\alpha\nu$. This appears to be confirmed by the facsimile. The supposed Δ in line 14 is perhaps an α belonging to the abbreviation $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha(\phi\epsilon\nu)$. It may be added that Dr. Cohen takes the document to be a record of letters received and sent, not, as Wilcken regards it, of letters received only, but his arguments do not carry conviction. $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha(\phi\epsilon\nu)$ in l. 19 may well refer to the provincial governor, as he holds; but this does not prove his point.

Dr. Viedebant's volume is a useful addition to the literature dealing with the difficult and complicated subject of ancient metrology. Its contents are of a somewhat miscellaneous character, but it falls into two main divisions. The first is devoted to the work of Epiphanius known as $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota$

$\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$, which has survived only very imperfectly. The author, it seems with justice, questions the appropriateness of this title, holding that the complete work was rather a biblical encyclopaedia, which dealt, among other subjects, with metrology. He devotes a detailed and enlightening discussion to the mutual relations of the Syriac translations and the various Greek excerpts. In the second part of the volume he publishes from Vatican MS. Gr. 2130 five short Greek metrological tracts, the first of which is a new excerpt from Epiphanius, while of the others two were previously unpublished, and discusses the critical and metrological questions to which they give rise. He uses Wilcken's standard work, *Griechische Ostraka*, but seems not to have followed very closely subsequent papyrological literature. Thus on p. 90f. he rejects Hultsch's view that the new artaba introduced by the Romans was equivalent to $3\frac{1}{2}$ Roman modii, holding that it was, as stated by three texts, really equivalent to 3 modii; but on the other hand he accepts the view of Hultsch, and of Wilcken in the *Ostraka*, that this new artaba was the 'thesauric artaba.' He has overlooked the evidence of P. Lips. I. 97, on the strength of which Wilcken has now (*Grundzüge*, p. lxix.) abandoned his view of the identity of the Roman and the thesauric artaba. In that papyrus occurs a $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\nu\ \mu\omicron\delta\iota\omega\nu$, which, as Mitteis shows in his introduction, is roughly equivalent to $3\frac{1}{2}$ modii, is clearly distinct from the thesauric measure, and, from its name, may naturally be taken as the official Roman artaba—i.e. the artaba 'in das der römische Modius umgerechnet wird' (Mitteis, p. 251). An element of difficulty is now added to the question by P. Cair. Masp. II. 67138, where corn payments for the *embola* are made in an artaba equivalent to 3 modii. Was an alteration made in the capacity of the official artaba in later times? And does this account for the difference between our authorities?¹

¹ Since the above was written I have found in the British Museum a papyrus (to be published in Vol. V. of the B.M. Catalogue) containing evidence which perhaps clears up the

The volume contains a plate giving a facsimile of two pages of the Vatican MS., tables of the measures in the various texts of Epiphanius, and good indices.

Dr. San Nicolò's book deals with a subject on which papyri afford a fair amount of evidence, the associations and guilds of Graeco-Roman Egypt. The scheme of the work excludes certain classes of corporations. The author points out that Greek and Roman law did not clearly distinguish between public and private associations; but we may say roughly that those embraced by this work belong rather to the latter category, while such more obviously official bodies as the colleges of priests or officials, the ethnic associations, and the like are excluded. Though, as already said, there is a fair amount of evidence, it is not by any means always unambiguous, and it may be doubted whether some of the associations recorded by the author were really associations at all—a doubt which, indeed, he himself admits. The present volume, which is the first of two, is mainly occupied with the collection of evidence for the various kinds of associations, which the author classes as 'Kultvereine,' 'Vereine von Altersgenossen,' 'Agonistische Vereine,' 'Berufsvereine,' and 'Private und sonstige Vereine.' He has read widely, and overlooks little published evidence, and his collection of the material will be very useful for purposes of reference; but it cannot be said that any new conclusions of great importance are established. For such conclusions the second volume will probably afford more scope.

One or two single points may be noted. On p. 29 the author remarks that even after the Roman conquest the 'Verehrung der Ptolemäer . . . bestand . . . als inoffizieller Kult noch in der Kaiserzeit fort.' This is, to say the least, misleading. The cult of Soter at Ptolemais, to which he refers, was not a case in point, but was due to the foundation of the city by Ptolemy Soter; he was worshipped not as a

Ptolemy, but as the god of the city; and the cult of a Cleopatra (see Wilcken, *Chrest.* 115), though puzzling, can certainly not be used to support his contention; it is noteworthy that she is identified with Aphrodite, and this, as Wilcken remarks, may account for the survival of the cult. Nor is it quite accurate to say (*ib.* note 2) that there are no certain traces of a Roman cult in Egypt; for that of Jupiter Capitolinus at Arsinoe was clearly such, though it is likely enough (Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 116) that it stood on a different footing from the other cults of Egypt. On p. 31 the author rightly leaves undecided the question whether the gymnasia were open to non-Greeks. The matter is now settled by a papyrus in the British Museum to which I have called attention in the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* VI., which shows an Egyptian family described as ἀπὸ γυμνασίου. In regard to the chapter on 'Berufsvereine' it may be noted that P. Hamb. I. 56, published since this volume, affords further valuable evidence on Byzantine guilds. On p. 128 the author's inference of a 'Genossenschaft der geschulten Lohnarbeiter' from P. Lond. IV. 1419, 1215 may be doubted; the entry under ὑπὲρ τῶν συντεχνιτῶν merely gives the total payments by all the guilds; a payment for the bronze-smiths is for some reason deducted from this, and the other guilds are specified below. On p. 194, note 3, the reference to an ἐποίκιον ποιμένων at Aphrodito in P. Heid. III. 1, p. 110 requires correction. This ἐποίκιον is always called Ποιμήν as an indeclinable proper name. The volume contains a good many misprints in the Greek quotations. On p. 109, l. 13 'kaiserlicher' is evidently a slip of the pen for 'königlicher.'

The fourth work on the list, which is the first of a projected series of volumes, deals mainly with the officials of the Ptolemaic fiscus, and for the most part with the οἰκονόμοι of various grades, their functions and place in the official hierarchy. The relationship to one another and to the public of the numerous officials of the financial organization is a complicated and difficult one, and it is a useful task that

matter. It records two modii standing to the artaba in the relation respectively of 3 and $3\frac{1}{2}$: 1.

the author has set himself, though some of his conclusions seem to rest on a rather conjectural basis. He gives at the end classified lists of the *οἰκονόμοι* known to us, which will serve as a conspectus of the available evidence. He makes a curious blunder on p. 36 (see too Table I., pp. 58, 59), where he regards the Ptolemais of P. Petrie II. 25 as the Greek city so called, and naturally finds it noteworthy 'dass der Ökonom des Arsinoïtischen Gaues seinen Amtssitz in der freien Griechenstadt Ptolemais hat!' The fact is, of course, that the place in question is *Πτολεμαῖς ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρου*, which was a village in the Arsinoite nome, and the context seems to make it clear that the person who had his 'Amtssitz' there was not the *οἰκονόμος*, but his deputy Charmes. The volume contains a surprisingly large number of misprints.

A good deal of attention has been paid lately to the judicial system of Ptolemaic Egypt; reference need only be made to Zucker's *Beiträge* (*Philologus*, Supplementband XII. Heft 1), to Mitteis's treatment of the subject in his *Grundzüge*, and to Lesquier's introduction to P. Lille II. Semeka's work, of which the volume under review is only the first, is much the most elaborate study which has yet appeared, and, in spite of some deficiencies, it deserves high praise. It is, indeed, unfortunate that it should have appeared too soon for the author to incorporate in it the valuable evidence of the already famous *Dikaionmata*, which, though relating primarily to Alexandrian procedure, adds materially to our knowledge on many points treated in the present work. Thus on p. 139 ff. he commits himself to a view of the *πολιτικοὶ νόμοι*

which is no longer tenable since the appearance of the *Dikaionmata*. Again, his assumption on p. 123 of jurisdiction by the *Chrematistae* in Alexandria and the other Greek cities becomes, in the light of the new evidence, improbable in the extreme. But though the unfortunate synchronism in the appearance of the two volumes renders some of Semeka's conclusions obsolete from the first, he will perhaps be able to utilize the new evidence by way of addenda to his second volume, and in any case his positive contributions to the subject he deals with are considerable. He lays stress on a fact which in dealing with such a subject one is often tempted to forget, that Ptolemaic law, not only in its practice, but in its theory, was less definite in many of its distinctions than modern law; that, for example, the 'Unterschied zwischen privatrechtlichen und strafrechtlichen Eingaben bezw. Klagen' was never systematically marked out; and he is more careful than some of his predecessors not to give to his picture of Ptolemaic procedure a degree of system which it did not attain, though in some cases even he seems to base on isolated pieces of evidence conclusions which they will hardly bear. Of special interest is his insistence on the judicial competence of the strategus. The present volume is devoted mainly to a discussion of the various judicial authorities, but the latter portion deals with actual procedure, a subject which will be continued in the second volume. There are a few, but not many, misprints; by a curious slip the author several times (pp. 266, 270, 274 f.) refers to the class of document called *ἐμφανισμός* as τὸ *ἐμφανισμόν*.

H. I. BELL.

MURRAY'S TRANSLATION OF THE RHESUS.

The Rhesus of Euripides. Translated by GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt. F.B.A. Crown 8vo. Pp. xii + 67. London: George Allen, May 23, 1913. Cloth, 2s. net. Paper, 1s. net.

THE name of Euripides is better known in England to-day than it has been for

NO. CCXLIV. VOL. XXVIII.

very many years, and that fact is mainly due to the translations of Professor Murray and the performances of his versions. This translation follows the lines of his previous renderings of plays; the iambics are translated into rhyming heroics, with great variety of pause; the choruses are translated into

P

widely different lyrical metres, among which the system of Tennyson's 'Daisy' is happily employed in the chorus that immediately precedes the entrance of Rhesus; one new experiment has been used this time in the Ossianic dirge with which the Muse laments her Thracian son. To review the verse translation of Professor Murray would be a belated task: it is only necessary to say that the same charm of language, the same subtle fancy, and the same power of giving meaning to slight touches in the original, with which his readers are now familiar, will be found here to the full. The translator is not only a professor, but a producer, not only διδάσκαλος, but χοροδιδάσκαλος; and the stage-directions are of special interest as coming from one of his experience; they do not, of course, profess to indicate what was done on the Attic stage, but how Professor Murray would wish to see it done; the part that is played by Dolon's wolfskin is specially suggestive.

In this Review it is the introduction that should perhaps claim chief attention. *Rhesus* as a literary creation has had a much disputed pedigree, with a suggestion of the bar sinister in every generation. Some years ago it would have been generally said that in the *Rhesus* we had a play, certainly not by Euripides, though bearing his name, and derived from a Book of the *Iliad* that could not possibly be by Homer. A few years ago Mr. Andrew Lang undertook to show that in vocabulary the *Doloneia* did not differ more from the other books of the *Iliad* than any other one book could be found to differ. Now Professor Murray defends the Euripidean authorship of the *Rhesus*, and in the course of his defence mentions that against the 177 words peculiar to the play among the dramas of Euripides we may set 220 in the much shorter *Cyclops*. He argues that we cannot set aside the external tradition, that the play suggests early achievement rather than imitative mediocrity, that there are touches like the lament of the Muse-mother at the end that are quite Euripidean. He finds it, therefore,

easiest to believe that it was an early work of Euripides, while he was still under Aeschylean influence, and that it was a pro-Satyrical play, a fact which would account for the somewhat special vocabulary and peculiar features of the play. He shows successfully that the use of the fourth actor is only apparent, and does not involve a late date.

Certainly it is difficult to believe that the play was not written in the fifth century, or that it was a conscious imitation of one of the great Three. The Sophoclean stamp that had been noticed in antiquity is not very apparent, except, perhaps, in the greater relevancy of the choruses and the interposition of the deity not as a *deus ex machina*, but in the action of the play; but the number of verbal parallels in Sophocles is even smaller than in Euripides. And if anybody was deliberately setting himself to imitate Euripides, would his play have had no prologue, no ἐμβόλημα, no *deus ex machina*? The dramatic construction of the play does not absolutely debar it from claiming Euripides as its author; for, although there is a curious oscillation of interest between the Dolon story and the Rhesus story, we have a duality of plots in the *Hecuba*, and the *Troades*, beautiful as it is, has an episodic character, though one which does not prevent it being truly dramatic. We notice that all these plays deal with Troy and have their scene laid in a camp. I have selected these three plays for another test to see if a further similarity could be found in them, and I find a result which at least is curious, even if no very definite conclusions can be drawn from it. A rapid calculation of trisyllabic feet in iambic lines gives me, including proper names, 58 examples in the *Rhesus*, 150 in the *Hecuba*, 195 in the *Troades*; but the strange thing is that of the 58 examples 22 are parts of πολέμιος (one πόλεμος), while in the *Hecuba* πολέμιος only comes seven times, and in the *Troades* only once (πόλεμος once also). The comparative absence of trisyllabic feet suggests early work.

Professor Murray has pointed out elsewhere (*Euripides and His Age*, p. 44), the interest that Athenians would

have been likely to feel in Thrace during Euripides' early days, and that is the period to which all the evidence would lead us to refer the play; but would anything except external tradition have made us assign this play to Euripides, if it had been recently discovered? After all, there must have been work at least as good as this play done by those

dramatists who beat the great tragedians in the Dionysiac contests. Is it not possible that we have in this play the work of one of them which has survived owing to some accident that we know nothing of, and which became confused quite early with Euripides' play of the same name?

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College.

GREEK FINAL CLAUSES.

Commentationes Aenipontanae, quas edit E. KALINKA. VII. De enuntiatis Graecorum finalibus, scr. I. KNUENZ, 44 pp. 9½' x 6½'. Innsbruck.

IN this treatise we have a summary of what is known of Greek final clauses (including 'pure final,' 'object' clauses, clauses dependent on verbs of fearing) from Homer to Lucian. For the most part it is a mere summary, a series of statistics, telling how many times in each author a construction occurs, and not attempting to show, except in a very general way, the difference between similar constructions, or the reason why one was preferred to another. Hence it is not in itself an interesting study. But it is useful as a supplement to other works. It puts together in a short space the results of a large number of separate studies. It helps us to watch the process of development. If we are in doubt as to the reading or the interpretation of a passage it enables us to see what authors make use of the construction in question and to what extent. If the usage is uncommon, the references are generally given, though not quite so often as we could wish.

The account of the final sentence in modern books is based to a great extent on Ph. Weber's *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze* (published in 1884-5 as part of M. Schanz's *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*). A detailed abstract of this work together with many valuable and interesting comments was given by Prof. Gildersleeve in the *American Journal of Philology*, vols. iv. and vi. Weber went down to Aristotle. Mr. Knuenz

has made Weber's work the basis of his own, but he has revised W.'s figures and has pursued the history of these sentences down to the Atticists. He has also himself made a study of the works which go under the name of Hippocrates, and has stated in detail the results which he has obtained for each of them separately. These writings are important in the history of the language, but the evidence which they provide of syntactical usage has hitherto been to a great extent neglected. There is no reference to Hipp. in the Index to the Examples in Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*. J. M. Stahl, whose *Syntax des griech. Verbums* often proves useful in supplementing Goodwin, quotes Hipp. at times, but he has not noticed (485) that in some of the Hippocratic writings the future ind. is not uncommon in pure final clauses. K. counts thirty-four examples with *ὅπως* and five with *ὥς*. In most of these he regards the reading as certain. Goodwin (§ 324, note) says 'Only four undoubted examples occur in prose.' Stahl accepts a much larger number. It is clear from the frequency of this construction in Aristophanes that in popular speech the 'pure final' was often not distinguished from the 'object clause.' It is a pity that K. did not include Menander and the other comic poets; on this and other points it would be interesting to know how they compare with Aristophanes. I pass to another point on which K. has something new to say. Prof. Gildersleeve wrote (*A. J. P.* iv. 443): 'What Weber says of Hippokrates, does not rest on personal research of his own . . . The most important point is the exclusive use of *ὥς* in complete final sentences.'

Weber was mistaken. K. shows that (1) in fourteen of the treatises *ὥς*, (2) in twenty-one *ὅκως*, is the prevailing (or the only) particle employed in the pure final clause. If we sum up the occurrences in these two groups separately we get the following numbers:

	<i>ὥς</i>	<i>ὥς ἄν</i>	<i>ὅκως</i>	<i>ὅκως ἄν</i>	<i>ἵνα</i>
Group (1) ...	82	11	18	1	8
Group (2) ...	16	3	85	12	7

If we compare these statistics with Goodwin, p. 398, we see that, as K. says, 'ista scripta Hippocratica in usu particularum finalium omnino singularia sunt,' especially in the comparative rarity of *ἵνα*. In the preference of *ὥς* the first group resembles the tragedians, with all of whom it is the favourite particle; *ὥς* is also used to some extent by Hdt. and to a considerable extent by Xen., who is in this as in so many ways peculiar; but in the orators and Plato together there are not half-a-

dozen examples. The *ὅκως* group may be compared with Thuc. and Xen. who prefer *ὅπως* to other final particles, but also use *ἵνα* freely.

K. has done his work carefully. But there is one figure which needs some explanation. He says on p. 40 (cp. pp. 10 and 15) that there are in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* 102 examples of *ὥς* (without *κεν* or *ἄν*) in pure final sentences. Ebeling in his *Lexicon Homericum* (1880) gives twenty-four or twenty-five, Goodwin (p. 398) following Weber gives the same number. To the bibliography might be added: J. F. Dobson, '*ὥς ἄν* and *ὅπως ἄν* in the Tragedians,' *Classical Review*, xxiv., (1910), pp. 143-4; W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Greek Verb, Rewritten*, 1897. K. apparently knows Goodwin only by his Greek Grammar.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

St. Paul's School, West Kensington, W.

THE EMANCIPATION OF ROMAN WOMEN.

Zur Geschichte der Frauenemanzipation im alten Rom. Von JOHANNES TEUFER. Pp. 43. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. M. 1.

THIS is a study of the opening chapters of Livy's thirty-fourth book, where the historian contrasts Cato the upholder of ancient tradition with the women who claimed an increasing freedom. The repeal of the Oppian Law was accompanied with such circumstances as those with which now we are familiar. The women of Rome, who resented the restrictions imposed upon them by the Oppian Law, refused to stay within doors. They occupied the approaches to the forum. 'They even dared,' says Livy, 'to approach and ask the support of the consuls, praetors and other magistrates.' Two of the tribunes had announced their intention of defending the obnoxious law. They were besieged in their houses and yielded. In the end the women gained the day and the hated law was repealed with the consent of all the tribes. Such is the setting of the speeches of Cato and Valerius.

Dr. Teufer has published this pamphlet as a preliminary to a larger work. After a translation of the two speeches, he examines their authenticity, and has little difficulty in showing that they were composed by the historian himself and that they contain little of Cato and less of Valerius. The rest of the pamphlet deals briefly with the legalized assemblages of women, which are traced to a religious origin; the position of women under the civil law; their part in public life. Obviously these large topics can only receive a superficial handling within the few pages which are devoted to them. I venture, however, to think that something should be added to what the author tells us about Livy's own treatment of the subject.

Since the two speeches are composed as a rhetorical exercise in which the arguments of Cato against the repeal of the Oppian Law are balanced by those of Valerius for the repeal of the Oppian Law, we cannot glean from them the opinions of the historian. But the frame in which the speeches are set contains some striking touches

in which we may trace Livy's own attitude to the emancipation of women. He interrupts the history of war to deal with a topic which he almost disdains to mention, *res parva dictu*. The behaviour of the Roman wife towards her husband is, or should be, governed by a natural modesty in presence of his authority and express orders, *auctoritate verecundia imperio*. It was presumption on her part even to approach and make requests to the leading magistrates. Here surely we see the provincial so far overwhelmed by the traditions of the great families of Rome, that he is blind to the facts before his eyes. The increasing influence of women is shown in two directions at least. In the first place it was already a tradition in the Julian house that women should stand by their husband's side in great affairs. The aunt of the dictator accompanied her husband in his campaign against the Teutones. Caesar refused to be separated from Cornelia even in order to secure himself. Livia looked upon the world—and upon Livy—with those calm imperial eyes that blend with the eyes of Venus in the museum at Arles. Not without meaning, therefore, was Venus the especial goddess of the Julii.

Through the patronage of noble Roman ladies foreign religions spread because of the hopes which they held out to women. And among these religions Christianity stood upon the threshold of the future. When therefore Augustus with a magnanimous jest described Livy as a Pompeian, he reached the limits of criticism. Livy drew his picture of an impossible past, of a Rome which never existed. It is also true that the partisans of Caesar failed to comprehend the whole of Rome. But Caesar's own *Commentaries* suggest that the modern student of Roman history has suffered greatly by the sifting out of the sources which the literature of the opposition completed in the interests of the Senate. The emperors of the first century and the ladies of their court are seen only through misrepresentations not less calculated than those of our own partisan press. It is not difficult, therefore, to thank Dr. Teufer for the promise of the work to which he has committed himself, and to express the hope also that he will subject his sources to a more rigorous criticism than in Livy's case.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

NEW TEUBNER TEXT OF THE *DE SENECTUTE*.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior de Senectute liber. Ed. C. SIMBECK. Pp. 1-58. Leipzig: Teubner. 1912.

DR. SIMBECK has studied carefully the chief MSS. which contain the *Cato Maior*, and provides a fuller apparatus than was previously in existence. The most valuable of the new material which he has collected, is a collation of Brux. 9591 (b), cent. ix. This MS. had previously been used by Anz and Kornitzer. Simbeck has used a photographic reproduction made for Vollmer. He says that the character of the hand closely resembles that found in the Paris MS. of the Verrines, 7774 A, and the Holkham MS. 387, collated by Dr. Peterson. Apparently it is a product of the Tours scriptorium. He gives a good account of the script in which it

is written and the compendia employed. In view of its antiquity and importance the MS. seems to deserve the honour of a capital letter, rather than a twelfth century MS. *Benedictoburanus*, which he allows to retain the symbol B.

Simbeck terms the archetype Ω . His use of this symbol is sometimes confusing. Thus § 73 he says *consequatur* Ω , om. V^1 , add. V^2 . This seems somewhat roundabout. It would be simpler to say, *consequatur* om. V^1 . On § 2, he says, *sicut* Ω , *sic* Charisi codex. As he prints *sicut*, the point of the note is not clear. In § 10 he prints *oenus*, and says in his note *unus* Ω . It would be well to say who made the change, just as in the next line he ascribes *noenum* to Lachmann. On p. 15, he says *fort. domo mos patrius*, but in his note on § 37 he quotes four MSS. for

the reading. On the same page he says *fortasse*, *percontantibus*, without mentioning that the conjecture was made previously by Mommsen, as he records in his note on § 20.

Simbeck's text is very conservative on the whole. It may be questioned, if he does not go too far in reading (§ 1) with the MSS.—

teque cognomen non solum Athenis deportasse sed humanitatem et prudentiam intellego.

Here editors generally give *non solum cognomen*, which seems necessary.

The few emendations which he suggests are not convincing—e.g. § 32: *nemo adhuc convenire me voluit cui fuerim occupatus*. The MSS. generally have *qui* (i.e. *quoi*) or *cum*. The dative gives an excellent sense—i.e., 'I never pleaded an engagement when anyone wished to see me.' Simbeck suggests *quin*, which seems contrary to the sense. In § 18 the MSS., except HE, give—

senatui quae sint gerunda praescribo et quo modo Karthagini cui male iam diu cogitanti bellum multo ante denuntio.

Here Müller marks a lacuna after *quo modo*. Simbeck emends *cui* to *cum*. This use of *cum* seems odd and the collocation *Karthagini cum . . . denuntio* is still more odd. I venture to think that *cui* is a corruption of the common dialectical mark *qu* or *q* (= *quaere*), used to show that there is something wrong,

which has got into the text from the margin. If so, the addition *inferatur* given by HE (without *cui*) may well be right.

Simbeck introduces a number of archaic spellings—e.g. *quor* (§ 13), *quouis* (§ 14). It seems strange to find combined with these the spelling *filii* (§ 12). The only reference which I have observed to a metrical point is on § 4 *quam putavissent*. Here he says 'putavissent sic Ω, nota clausulam.' There is nothing remarkable about the clausula, which is Zielinski's i. β.

The editor refers to an early work of my own thus (p. 9):

'Quod *V* saepe a *P* et *L* discrepat. Clarkius censebat eum neque ex *P* aut *L* redire. Quae opinio falsa est.'

I quite agree that it would be. But my words were:

'*LA* represent one family, and *P* the other, both being referred back to the same archetype. *V* resembles *P* rather than *L*.'

I say here distinctly, that *V* does go back to the same *fons* as *P* and *L*, and is more closely connected with *P* than with *L*. Our opinions are identical, as will be seen from Simbeck's *Stemma*.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

² *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, vii., p. xx (1892).

LEO'S HISTORY OF LATIN LITERATURE.

Leo's *History of Latin Literature*. Vol. I. (*Archaic Literature*). Published by Weidmann, Berlin. 1913. Price 12s.

THIS volume, the first instalment of a complete history of Latin literature, is a beautiful piece of work, representing the mature thought of a great scholar on a subject to which the studies of a lifetime had been directed. It is sad indeed to have to add that the history to which it belongs will never be completed, and that readers who wish to form an idea of the way in which the author would have treated the subsequent periods of Latin literature, must turn to the sketch which he published

in Hinneberg's *Kultur der Gegenwart*.¹ In the present volume the development of Latin verse and prose is traced from Livius Andronicus to Lucilius with a firm hand and with a wealth of illustration which attracts and convinces the reader. Leo has clearly envisaged the whole story, and he speaks with the authority of one who is a master of all the details that go to make up the picture. It is not a mere book of reference, like Teuffel's; it is a book to be read through continuously: for a unity of conception dominates the whole.

¹ An obituary notice of Professor Leo appeared in the *Classical Review* for February, 1914.

The leading idea is the recognition that Latin literature, deeply indebted as it was to Greece, was not a mere reflexion of Greek literature, but rather a continuation of it on lines determined by the genius of the Roman people. The Romans did not, like so many barbarous peoples, merely take on a varnish of Greek culture; they made out of the elements of that culture something of their own, which was superior to the products of contemporary Greek work (pp. 50, 62, etc.). And it was the originality of Latin literature which qualified it to exercise the enormous influence which it actually did exercise on the literatures of other nations.

The difficulties which the creators of Latin literature had to face and overcome are powerfully stated. The language was in a crude condition, and there was practically nothing in the way of popular song or ballad or drama on which the first writers could build. Leo rejects the account of the early development of the drama which is given by Livy (vii. 2), availing himself of the main results arrived at by Hendrickson. The only preparation which had been made for the work of Livius Andronicus and his successors lay in the field of 'Recht und Rede,' which is lucidly treated in Chapter II. Rhetoric, developed for practical purposes in the Senate, the popular assemblies, and the law courts, was in fact the principal means by which the Latin language was turned into material which the early poets could use for their own purposes (p. 33).

Chapter III gives an admirable account of the work of Livius Andronicus, setting forth the reasons why he turned to Athens, not to Alexandria, for his models. Andronicus knew nothing of Callimachus; the whole culture of Alexandria was incongruous with the needs of Rome at this time, though, later on, when Rome had herself become metropolitan, the products of Alexandria were welcomed. What Andronicus and other Greek *libertini* brought to Rome was the literature with which they had become familiar in their own homes; and this was not Hellenistic literature. The merit of seeing that Rome offered a field for a

'reincarnation of the spirit of Greek literature'¹ belongs to Andronicus. He was also the creator of Roman metrical art and science: for he not only introduced Greek metres in his dramas, but also latinized them, and thus rendered them capable of living on Roman soil. And to the Saturnian he gave a literary existence in his translation of the *Odyssey* (p. 69). It was reserved for Ennius to see the superiority of the hexameter as the metre for epic poetry. In Leo's account of the iambic and trochiac metres (pp. 64-69) I am glad to see that he fully recognizes the principle to which I have called attention on several occasions, *viz.*, that accent is a structural element in all Latin verse.² I know of no other writer on verse by whom this principle has been stated so clearly. Leo also accepts my doctrine of a 'compensatory accent,' *i.e.*, an accent at one point of the verse compensating for the failure of accent at another point (the fourth rise of iambs, according to Leo, p. 68)—a doctrine since endorsed by Wallstedt.³ As to the so-called 'iamb shortening,' Leo does not go beyond the doctrine expressed in his *Plautinische Forschungen*, 2nd ed., 1912.⁴ Incidentally he dissents from Skutsch's article in *Glotta*, as to the initial accent of Latin having been due to Etruscan influence (p. 10, note).

Justice is done in Chapter IV to the originality and the nationalism of Naevius. He probably prepared the way for the development of metre which we find in Plautus; he was the first to employ 'contaminatio'; and he was the first to write not only 'praetextatae' but also 'togatae' (p. 91 *f.*, *cf.* p. 370).

Chapter V deals with Plautus—his life, his relation to his Greek originals (different in different plays), his great innovation in the metrical field (the lyrical passages, based on contemporary Hellenistic work), his employment of 'contaminatio' and finally his style and language, which is far from being

¹ This is Professor Postgate's phrase.

² *Classical Review*, 1905, p. 252 ff. (on the Latin Sapphic): 1906, p. 156 ff. (Accent and Quantity in Plautine Verse).

³ *Studia Plautina*, 1909.

⁴ See my article in *Classical Review*, 1913, pp. 237-239.

'vulgar Latin' (p. 148). On the whole I find this chapter, good as it is, less original and interesting than some of the others. Most of the new things that Leo had to say on Plautus had already been written in his *Forschungen*. His discussion of the date of the post-Plautine part of the prologue to the *Casina* (pp. 212-217, ch. vii.) does not seem to me conclusive.

The account of Ennius in Chapter VI reinforces Leo's view as to the originality of Latin literature. When Ennius declared that the soul of Homer dwelled in him, he proclaimed that he was no mere imitator of Homer, but his compeer and rival. And a similar ambition inspired all the early Latin writers. The metrical innovations of Ennius, which mark the third stage in the development of Roman metric (p. 186), are treated in detail. But I am surprised to find in this passage no reference to the rôle of accent in the Ennian hexameter. As to 'iamb-shortening' Ennius no doubt made little use of it in his *Annals*; but Leo seems to force the evidence when he doubts whether Ennius used it at all (p. 185 n.). The instance *Virgines nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas* (*Ann.* 110) is not really disposed of by reading *Virginis* and connecting this word with the preceding sentence; nor is it true that *nam* must always begin a sentence in verse (cf. *Hor. Epist.* II., 1., 186). I must add that I use the term 'iamb-shortening' merely as a *façon de parler*, here as elsewhere.

Caecilius, Pacuvius, and Terence are the subject of Chapter VII ('The successors of Plautus and Ennius'), to which is prefixed a discussion of what Leo calls an important document in the history of Literature—the prologue to the *Casina* of Plautus, ll. 5-20. In the account of Terence, more might have been made of the influence which was exerted on him by his association with the Scipionic circle. Its humanism (described in the next chapter) must have been one of the factors that produced the refinement and the interest in character drawing which are so prominent in Terence. This is not denied by Leo, but it is implied rather than expressed. It is to Terence (or

Menander) that we owe that watchword of Stoicism (*Heaut.* 77):

Homo sum : humani nihil a me alienum puto.

The gem of Chapter VIII ('Literature and Roman Culture') is the account given of the influence of Stoicism on the literature and the life of the second century, B.C. (pp. 315-325). The relation of Polybius to the younger Scipio is beautifully depicted (pp. 316-321 and p. 480, where Polyb. xxxii. 9 is translated). The world-wide significance of Stoicism is due to its connexion with Rome; and the secret of its success in Rome is finely expressed in the following sentence: 'In the Stoic ethics the aspiring Roman found the scientific foundation of the old Roman ideal, as it lived in the tradition of his home.' Full justice is done to 'Romano-stoic humanism' in these pages, and to the fact that it dominated Latin literature from the days of the Scipionic circle to those of Marcus Aurelius, and thus became a potent factor in the romanizing of Western Europe. Its influence on jurisprudence and on philology is also treated in an illuminating way (pp. 348f., p. 361f.).

The 'togata', Accius, and Lucilius form the subject of Chapter IX. I find myself in complete sympathy with what is here said about Roman satire, and its creator Lucilius. The name, it is true, was used earlier, by Ennius; but his *saturae* had nothing satirical about them. *Satura* proper denotes the type of didactic verse which took its start in the school founded by Lucilius and subsequently represented by Horace, Persius, and Juvenal (p. 206). It is this kind of satire of which Quintilian said 'tota nostra est' (p. 423).

The book concludes with a 'Rückblick' (pp. 439-443). 'This warlike people was ready to yield to foreign influences, but incapable of giving up its own nature' (p. 439). 'Roman culture is, as a whole, a new culture, which is neither Roman nor Greek, but Romano-Greek' (p. 443).

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

30, Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston,
Birmingham,
April 24, 1914.

THE NEW PALAEOGRAPHY.

The Beneventan Script: a History of the South Italian Minuscule. By E. A. LOEW. Pp. xx+384. With many illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 21s.

LUDWIG TRAUBE, the Munich professor, made a new epoch in Latin Palaeography. He showed us a new world to conquer and how to conquer it. This book, by a pupil of his, following his methods, brings us the spoils from one wide province annexed by this peaceful warfare: we have here the firstfruits of the New Palaeography.

The difference between this account of Beneventan script and previous treatises is the difference between mid-day and twilight, or rather gloom. All was vague before. A palaeographer of the old style, if asked for a verdict on a MS. of this class, say that eleventh to twelfth-century MS. of Juvenal in which Mr. Winstedt found the famous passage, would (in Sterne's phrase) assume a mysterious carriage of the body to cover the defects of the mind, and reply: 'Hum! ha! Lombardic.' He would make the same reply if one showed him (1) any minuscule MS. of France or Italy written before the introduction of Caroline minuscule, (2) most ninth-century MSS. of Germany, or of Switzerland, or of Burgundy, (3) any MS. in Visigothic script, (4) any in the Corbie ab-type, and so on. He might venture to pronounce that Mr. Winstedt's MS. was written in Southern Italy, but he would not be able to stand much cross-examination on his verdict. It is many years since Traube exposed the errors and the dangers of this vague use of the term 'Lombardic'; but old usage dies hard. This book will, we hope, kill and bury it once for all.

Dr. Loew tells us that the designation 'littera Beneventana' for the writing practised in the old Duchy of Benevento, i.e. the southern half of Italy, is as early as the eleventh century and probably earlier; that the script itself was developed gradually from the old Italian minuscule (in the eighth century it is still indistinguishable from North Italian

script) until it received its distinctive form in the ninth and tenth centuries; that it reached its highest artistic level in the eleventh, and persisted to the end of the thirteenth. He shows us in detail each criterion for dating and localising, all the minutiae of ligatured letters, of punctuation, of abbreviation. The 'eius' abbreviation is the shibboleth of Beneventan scribes, and is mistaken for 'qui' by other transcribers. He takes us into the scriptorium of Monte Cassino and lets us hear the first instruction of Desiderius' monks in penmanship: how the syllable *ti*, when pronounced like *z*, must be written in a peculiar fashion; how the letter *i*, when pronounced like *y* (or *j*), demanded the long form (making it impossible to mistake, e.g., *ius* for *uis*); how interrogative sentences had to be punctuated in one way if the answer was merely 'Yes' or 'No,' but in another if the answer became a statement of fact. Most of this we learn for the first time from Dr. Loew, and we learn it with such a wealth of illustration and explanation and such a mass of evidence that we can neither doubt it nor forget it.

The greater part of the book is of interest to historians rather than to readers of this journal. Dr. Loew provides, in fact, a history of the spread of culture in Southern Italy from the end of the eighth to the end of the thirteenth century, and shows how historical changes are reflected in the vicissitudes of the script. He gives lists too of the extant MSS., of the scriptoria and of the scribes of Southern Italy, which will be useful to librarians and palaeographers. But classical scholars will find most to interest them within the chapters dealing with the script itself. Beneventan minuscule has played so important a part in the transmission of the Latin Classics¹ that no scholar can afford to be ignorant of at least this branch of Latin Palaeography. Indeed, when we reflect that the Latin texts

¹ Not Varro's *De Lingua Latina* (as stated on p. 18), but merely Priscian's *De Figuris Numerorum*, with a quotation from Varro L. L. V., is contained in Paris 7530.

took most of their injuries from the hands of medieval scribes, it seems little short of amazing that even in our eminently practical nation there should still be Latin scholars who dispense lightly with all study of medieval palaeography. The pages of our learned journals are still filled with long lists of haphazard emendations, which take no account of the conditions under which an author's text was transmitted in writing, and indeed often do not reveal any thorough study of an author's language and style. No self-respecting editor admits one out of a hundred of these emendations into an edition. Yet the flow never ceases. What a waste of time it seems to write them! And how unsatisfying to read them! Sauce, much sauce, is needed for the meagre fare.

This book must be the model for future books on Latin Palaeography. When shall we have a similar account of Irish minuscule, a script equally important for Latin scholars? What is so often said of it, that its conservatism makes it difficult to date, has hitherto been said of Beneventan too. But, as Dr. Loew here shows us, all that was needed was a thorough investigation which left no single specimen of the script unexamined. Beneventan minuscule can now be dated as easily as Caroline. Not the least merit of Sir E. M. Thompson's *Introduction to Palaeography* is that he has made it impossible for teachers of this subject to spend their energies in writing another manual. If they are not to be drones in the hive, they must do some work on Dr. Loew's lines. Even persons who are merely interested in the science and wish to do

what they can to help its progress, will learn from Dr. Loew's book what kind of statistics are worth gathering. Such material, if published in a magazine or handed over to a palaeographer (not a drone), will be of use sooner or later. With our noble collections of MSS., our Palaeographical Society's Publications, our opportunities and love of travel, Englishmen ought surely to take the lead in this new advance.

By the way, we would advise the reader not to begin with Dr. Loew's Preface, which somehow or other suggests that an amateur performance is going to follow, and recalls Professor Zimmer's criticism of a somewhat effusive 'commemoratio beneficentium' by a young author. 'How many cooks!' said the German critic. But Dr. Loew's broth has certainly not been spoiled.

One could wish that the binding, printing and paper were less worthy of the Clarendon Press. For, after all, this is a book rather for the study than the drawing-room, and not every student can afford a guinea for it. There has been too much (in our opinion) needless cutting of new types. For example, why was Dr. Loew not content with the phrase: 'the Corbie ab-script' (with the 'ab' printed in ordinary form)? It should be a matter of conscience with palaeographers to make their publications as inexpensive as possible. A companion-volume by Dr. Loew is announced by the Clarendon Press, *Scriptura Beneventana*, with a large number of plates, to cost £10. Palaeography will be refused admission to University Libraries if this sort of thing goes on.

W. M. LINDSAY.

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS.

THERE is much good work in J. Thompson's *First Year Latin Book* (Cambridge University Press, 2s.); it is well planned, the explanations are clearly put, the print is excellent. But the sentences often seem unsatisfactory in one way or another—e.g. p. 130, *exercitus est tam parvus ut non eum timeamus*, the position of *non* is unnatural,

for *eum* is not intended to be emphatic; or again, p. 53, 'the many gifts and kindnesses of the fort do not open the minds of the savage allies.' The author rightly insists that the words should be common. It is equally important that the whole sentence should be obviously good Latin of an ordinary type. It is not very difficult to make

better sentences with a small vocabulary, but it is necessary constantly to test them by comparison with Latin models.

We have received new editions of *Macmillan's Latin Course*, Part II. (minor changes suggested by recent experience). and of *Limen* (general revision and a few changes in terminology). E. H. Scott and Frank Jones have written *A Shorter Second Latin Course* (Blackie, 2s.) as an alternative to their larger work; the book is based on *Caes. B. G. I.* 1-29, and is very well done.

In *The Shorter Aeneid* (Bell, 2s. 6d.) Mr. H. H. Hardy, of Rugby aims at giving an idea of the poem as a whole to those who have not time to read more than half of the original; 'many difficult passages and lines do not appear, in particular those in which the mythology or textual uncertainty would require lengthy notes.' A well written summary in English takes the place of the omitted passages. The print is good; there are a few notes at the end. The editor has done his work well, though no doubt everyone will feel, as we do, that some of the omitted passages ought to be there. Professor H. E. Butler, who contributes a Preface and Introduction (both of which are well worth reading), defends the omission of VI. 752-846, in which 'the heroes of the Rome that is to be pass before the eyes of Aeneas,' on the ground that it involves a wide knowledge of Roman history. Yet, surely, from Virgil's day onward this passage has been enjoyed as few other passages have been, and that by many whose notions of the history were very vague. For pupils who know enough Latin to read at some pace this book is well worth considering. But there is an earlier stage for which it does not provide, that in which the pupil is getting used to the language of Virgil. At this stage he must necessarily read slowly. For this preparatory stage we should choose either Book II. or Professor E. V. Arnold's '*Aeneae Facta et Fata*, a stepping-stone to Virgil, with notes and exercises on the text for the use of beginners,' which contains the substance of I., II., and IV. Mr. Hardy has

removed some difficult passages, but we should make a point of attaining a certain facility before beginning his book, so that it might be read rapidly, and some 'idea of the beauty and significance of the poem as a whole' might be gained.

We recommend Professor Granger's *Roma Aeterna* (Dent, 130 pp., 1s. 4d.), especially to those who are familiar with the remains of Ancient and Early Christian Rome. It consists of thirty-one 'Latin readings in the history of the city,' partly drawn from ancient writings, including the Vulgate, partly written by the Editor. A few lines from his Prooemium will explain his purpose: 'Tempus est, mi puer, qui tamdiu linguae Latinae studes, ut intellegere conere, quid litteris Graeci, legibus Romani, praedicatione Christiani effecerint, haec enim ex libris solum non potes discere: sed aedificia ipsa, oppidorum moenia, strata viarum . . . testantur, quales ii fuerint qui fecerunt.' The illustrations and notes are good. We wish the Editor had given us another thirty or forty pages of text instead of the Vocabularies; anyone who is competent to read this book should be able to deal with a Latin dictionary.

J. Marouzeau—*Conseils pratiques pour la traduction du Latin* (59 pp., 1 fr.)—is the author of several excellent grammatical studies, two of which have been noticed in our columns (xxv. 60; xxvi. 129). In this little book he has not a great deal that is new to say, but he writes from such an intimate knowledge of Latin, and puts his advice so well that it is a pleasure to read him. He warns the student against the inappropriate use of 'cette langue traditionnelle de la version latine qui appelle "airain" le "bronze" et "char" la "voiture" . . . En général on s'inspirera de la langue vivante et courante, on repensera les idées de l'auteur latin en français d'aujourd'hui.' He notes some important things, e.g.—a point often ignored in elementary teaching—the emphasis given to the possessive by placing it before the noun: 'meus amicus venit, c'est mon ami à moi qui est venu.' Σ.

NEW TEUBNER TEXT OF THE ANNALS.

P. Cornelii Taciti libros qui supersunt recognovit CAROLUS HALM. Editionem quintam curavit GEORGIUS ANDRESEN. Tomus Prior. Qui libros ab excessu Divi Augusti continet. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubner. MCMXIII.

THE fifth edition of Halm's *Annals* acquires great authority from the words 'curavit Georgius Andresen' on the frontispiece. Hitherto Dr. Andresen's important contributions to Tacitean textual criticism, which were but sparingly revealed in his revision of Nipperdey, have lain scattered in the 'studia critica et palaeographica,' and in the pages of German periodicals. Now after thirty years, as far at least as the *Annals* are concerned, everything is concentrated in a single volume of this Teubner series. Dr. Andresen has chiefly set his mark on the text of Tacitus by the skill with which he has detected first-hand corrections in Medicean II. These corrections, with certain exceptions—e.g. 'augusta' xii. 26, 'duri locis in margine' xii. 55, 'contemnere' xiii. 3, 'ut' for 'utque' xiii. 24, 'cura' xiv. 6, and probably 'humo' xiv. 9, either point to the truer reading or are themselves true. Their value, it may be added, is indirectly attested by Dr. Loew, who believes that they are of such a kind as to make it improbable that the MS. itself is later than 1050 ('Beneventan Script,' p. 137 note).

Through the help of these corrections—first revealed by Dr. Andresen and estimated at their true importance—many difficult passages have been healed. In xii. 64 'sus fetum edidit' is certain, in xiii. 32 the bold emendation of Acidalius 'quem ovasse de Britannis rettuli,' is confirmed by the discovery that M¹ has corrected 'qui' to 'qem.' There are many other places: xi. 8 'properaverat,' xi. 33 'Caesari,' xiii. 14 'inde debilis Burrus,' xv. 28 'laetioris ibi rei,' where M¹ is obviously right. Of xvi. 22 'si imperium everterint,' which is based on a marginal correction, and xi. 28 'cubiculum

per principis exultaverit,' it is not so easy to be positive. But clearly M¹ has suggested the best solutions hitherto available.

Of independent conjectures Dr. Andresen is sparing. In i. 49 he reads 'cuncta' for 'cetera' rather unnecessarily, and the same may be said of 'jungerentur' for 'vincerentur,' ii. 52. In xiv. 39 'post paucas,' xiv. 61 'strepitu venerantium,' xv. 54 'parari jubet idque,' xiii. 31 'et edixit,' are much more certain. Valuable notes in the apparatus appear at i. 34, where the peculiar virgula in the text is explained from other passages, and there are good suggestions, many of which, though not adopted in the text, are probably right, for example: 'ausurum' ii. 8, 'pluribus' iv. 24, 'sane' vi. 14, 'Tettium' xi. 35, ['quin'] xii. 20, 'multa' xiii. 6, 'nocturnosque' xiv. 32, 'Celere' xv. 34. In xiii. 56, the suggestion of a 'lacuna' is certainly preferable to the emendation 'deserentibus,' and in xv. 61 there is much to be said for 'adversus praesentem (sc. uxorem) formidine.' Less probable are the conjectures: 'oculis' for 'odiis' in xii. 2, 'oraculum' in xii. 22, 'timore' xv. 63, while the bracketing of 'aut flammandi atque' xv. 44, is extremely doubtful.

Dr. Andresen has done very good service in the matter of proper names—e.g. 'Faianio' i. 73, 'Agerinum,' xiv. 7, but very often the authority of an inconsistent scribe is exalted above the requirements of common-sense. Thus in the same chapter (ii. 86) Polionis and Polioni jostle one another, although in iii. 71 where the Medicean gave 'Malluginensem' and 'Maluginensi,' the latter spelling is adopted in both places. In ii. 86 it just happens that Polio is an authentic spelling, and so the common error of which we have an example in iii. 71, is treated as holy and not to be touched. There are other examples—sometimes names and sometimes ordinary words: 'Messalla' iv. 34, but elsewhere 'Messala,' 'Treviros' iii. 40, 'Treviri' i. 41, 'ballistis' xii. 36 'balistis' xv. 9, 'Pharasanem' xii. 45, 'Pharasanen' xii.

46. There is nothing to be gained by this kind of thing.

In vi. 29 an inaccuracy of Halm's is repeated. Walther never read 'Sexilia,' he only preferred it, and the same is true of Halm's 'poscebantque' in xiii. 52. But Walther, in xiii. 20, did suggest 'si qui,' and should be credited with it, and in the same chapter Puteolanus should be credited with 'et ex.' Lipsius put the beginning of Book VI.

at chapter xi., not at chapter vii. This is another error inherited from the fourth edition.

However, these are small matters. The truth remains that not since Rhe-nanus, Froben's reader at Basle, has any single scholar done more for the text of Tacitus, than the reviser of this fifth edition of the *Annals*.

C. D. FISHER.

Christ Church, Oxford.

SHORT NOTICES

English Literature and the Classics. Collected by G. S. GORDON. 8vo., pp. 252. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6s. net.

THIS is a collection of nine lectures by Oxford scholars on the influence of classics in the history of literature. The titles are *Tragedy*, by Gilbert Murray, *Platonism* by J. A. Stewart, *Theophrastus* by G. S. Gordon, *Greek Romances* by J. S. Phillimore, *Ciceronianism* by A. C. Clark, *Vergil* by H. W. Garrod, *Ovid* by S. G. Owen, *Satura* by R. J. E. Tiddy and *Senecan Tragedy* by A. D. Godley. The essays vary much in merit from that of a mere uninspired catalogue of parallels between Ovid and English writers from Chaucer downwards, to that of a real appreciation of the subject in question. Mr. Garrod on Virgil as 'half a Celt' is excellent; we have rarely read anything so good within so short a space. Prof. Stewart makes a good distinction between what he calls *personal* and *traditional* Platonism and compares the *Platonic mood* with Wordsworth's 'amplitude of mind' which pictures in tranquillity 'nature's living images.' His essay embodies much of that very spirit of Plato which made *The Myths of Plato* so remarkable a work. The essay on Theophrastus contains very interesting remarks on the connection between character-writing and comedy, 'to every Theophrastus his Menander,' and the whole collection should be very valuable to students of English literature. It should also help to jog the classical

scholar out of any rut into which he may have sunk by presenting to him a wider outlook upon his subject.

R. B. APPLETON.

Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin. By F. W. WESTAWAY. Cambridge: University Press. 1913.

MR. WESTAWAY's heart is in the right place; that is, in what the present reviewer regards as the right place. He is a thoroughgoing adherent of the reformed pronunciation of Latin, and, as that reform still needs advocates in some quarters, his little book will do good service. He has clearly given a considerable amount of attention to the subject, and he writes with conviction. Some points I find very happily put, *e.g.* his statements about doubled consonants (p. 30), his rules of syllable division (pp. 32, 33), his protest against reading Latin verse with an 'ictus' after the school-boy fashion (p. 88). But some matters of detail call for reconsideration, *e.g.*, the comparison of the Latin diphthong *æ* with the German *ä*, which is not a diphthong (p. 11), and the accentuation of words like *cunctāne*, *respicēdum* (p. 69); here the writer puts the accent on the syllable preceding the enclitic, as in *virūmq̄ue*. This point has been set at rest by Wagener. And why should the accentuation *intēr nos* be ruled out (p. 71)? Cf. *apūd me*. The writer seems never to have heard of the accentuation on the first syllable of words of the

shape 0000 (cf. § 93).¹ And what evidence is there that when an elided vowel is the same as the vowel that follows, it is suppressed *entirely*, e.g., *ergo omnis* = *ergomnis* (p. 41)? Again, synizesis is not due to dislike of hiatus, as is said on p. 43; nor is there reason to suppose that words like *aurea, omnia* (three syllables) were offensive to the Roman ear. Why is the form *heri* ('yesterday') ignored on p. 45? That *es* from *edo* has a naturally long vowel is a moot question (p. 47). The whole treatment of English verse in chapter xii. raises questions too thorny to be discussed here. It is intended to point a contrast between English verse and Latin verse. But I am sorry to see that Mr. Westaway does not recognise that accent is a structural element in Latin verse, not only as varying the rhythm, but also as reinforcing it.

The main doctrine of the book is, however, sound. Indeed, the writer is so severely scientific that he is led sometimes to advocate an almost impossibly high ideal of perfection in practice. What are called 'very bad faults' are in some cases surely venial, e.g. the pronunciation of *nisi* as 'nissy' (p. 7). This, however, is a matter of opinion.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

30, Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston.

TWO DISSERTATIONS ON PROSE METRE.

BLUM. *De compositione numerosa dialogi Ciceronis de Amicitia*. Pp. 1-78. Innsbruck, 1913.

THIS work is modelled upon a previous treatise of A. Ausserer on the clausulae of Minucius Felix and Cicero *de Senectute* (Innsbruck, 1906). Blum adopts Zielinski's method of marking caesura by the symbols α , β , γ , etc., and his three chief forms are in the main identical with those of Zielinski. The other forms are given different names. Thus the S clausulae are termed iv, and Zie-

linski's form iv becomes v. Most of the examples which Blum gives for his other forms (vi, vii, viii) are varieties of Zielinski's form ii. It cannot be said that his terminology makes for lucidity.

The Innsbruck metrists have a way of dealing with iambic words which calls for comment. The rule as given by Quintilian is *est autem in omni voce utique acuta sed numquam plus una nec unquam ultima ideoque in disyllabis prior* (i. 5. 31). This being so, it follows that where an iambus comes before the final trochee, e.g. *stabilis potest esse*, there is a conflict between word-accent and ictus. Zielinski's tables show that all combinations in which there is any such conflict were seldom used and in course of time disappeared. Wolf sought to remove the conflict in this particular case by supposing that the personal pronouns (e.g. *meus*), adverbs (e.g. *modo*) and such verbs as *sumus, velit* were enclitics. Cauer boldly extends this theory to *iambische Wörter oder iambische Silbenfolge überhaupt* (Pacianus, pp. 14, sqq.). He is followed by Ausserer and Blum, who mark, e.g. *virī boni fuerint, ita dicam gregē*. I can only remark (1) that analogies from comedy prove nothing for the *sermo urbanus*, (2) that the phenomena noticed by Zielinski seem to show that the conflict was felt and avoided, (3) that Cauer's theory is in flat contradiction to the main rule of Latin accentuation as laid down by Quintilian.

It is difficult to see why Blum should find it necessary to discuss such an elementary fact as the lengthening of a short vowel by position. Thus (p. 4.) he writes *erit laetabitur, faciemus rogati*, etc.; and proceeds to argue that the vowel must be lengthened, in order to produce a good rhythm.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

Tacitus, Dialogus. By W. PETERSON. *Agricola, Germania*. By M. HUTTON. (Loeb Series.) Heinemann.

THIS is a useful volume of rather unequal merit. Professor Peterson has done much work on the dialogue, and

¹ This alternative accentuation (e.g. *facilius*, side by side with *facilius*) is supported by the evidence of Old Latin dramatic verse and also of Ciceronian clausulae.

though one regrets that he clings to an early date for its composition in spite of the Maternus passage in Dio. lxvii. 12, all that he says is worth saying and complete. It is not quite the same with Professor Hutton's portion of the work. A reader need only consult the bibliographies prefixed to the two translations to form a comparative judgment. The bibliography given by Professor Peterson is really of some value, but to give Boissier, as Professor Hutton does, for the sole book of general reference on Tacitus, is rather inadequate. Again, in the matter of MSS., while Professor Peterson calls attention to the Iesi MS. and Annibaldi's work upon it, no mention is made of this MS. by Professor Hutton. Probably collaboration in a single introduction at the beginning of the book instead of the three introductions in three different places, the first independent of the other two, would have been the wiser plan. The translation, however, is the main object of this series. Professor Peterson is accurate, if rather unadorned; but Professor Hutton, though sometimes felicitous, is often undignified and transatlantic in his idiom. 'Sometimes it even chooses

the winner' for 'aliquando et elegit' rather suggests a bookmaker, and the translation 'he decided to put his hat-red in cold storage' for 'statuit reponere odium,' sounds like a phrase from the 'Letters of a self-made merchant to his son.' The word 'trek' is undesirable, and 'tattle and tragedy' is insignificant for 'famam fatumque' in c. 42 of the *Agricola*. As an instance of over-translation, one might quote 'they flaunted like a meteor past the fleet' for 'ut miraculum praevehebantur,' 'vigilant courtesy' is hardly right for 'comitate curandi,' and the phrase 'Germanorum libertas' means more in fewer words than 'the Germans fighting for liberty.'

One may wonder at the use in such a series of some of the appendices. In Professor Peterson these appendices take the form of critical notes of a rather advanced kind, while Professor Hutton gives a long dissertation on Roman names, and follows it up with some cheerful observations on 'terminological exactitudes' in connection with 'barditus.'

C. D. FISHER.

Christ Church, Oxford.

NOTES AND NEWS

WE have received a copy of *Iris*, the news-sheet of the Classical Association of Victoria. It is to be published monthly, showing the events to come. This number announces two series of lectures, one in the morning, one in the afternoon, about once a fortnight; the subjects are either a classical author (such as Virgil, Catullus, Horace), or a classical topic (Classics at the Cross-roads, Aeschylus and Shakespeare, Our Debt to Greece). Personal notes follow. Our readers will welcome this evidence of life in distant places, and wish all success to the Victorian branch.

A specimen has been sent to us of a new Latin periodical, *Alma Roma: singulis mensibus editum Romae, Via del*

Governo Vecchio 96 (9 lire per annum in Italy; 12 lire, or 10s., abroad), edited by Dr. Joseph Fornari. It is not illustrated, like *Vox Urbis*. It contains political notes, a paper on 'Martialis Rusticanus,' one on the source of Dante's *Divina Comedia*, verses, some general articles on art or morals, a dialogue, reviews, and 'Roma Sacra.' Its tone is indicated by the motto: 'Quidquid non possidet armis, religione tenet.'

A correspondent has kindly sent us a prospectus from Carolus Beyaert, a publisher in Bruges, setting forth a collection of *Bullaria Ordinum Religiosorum vel Pontificum*, which he proposes to publish. It is written in

clear and good Latin, which amongst other things promises good print and paper: istud porro chartae genus numquam ex vetustate lurida fiet sed album suum nitorem semper servabit. Belgium, as our readers know, has pro-

duced two excellent books of Latin lessons in Latin: may this be a sign that there is felt to be a better way than Esperanto! Anyhow, civilisation owes much to Belgium. Vivat in aeternum Belgarum gloria!

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

. *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

- Bezard (J.)** Comment apprendre le Latin à nos fils. 7½" × 4½". Pp. 424. Paris: Vuibert, 1914.
- Boll (F.)** Aus der Offenbarung Johannis. Hellenistische Studien zum Weltbild der Apokalypse. 9" × 6". Pp. viii + 151. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 5.
- Byrde (O. R. A.)** Euripides, Heracles. 7½" × 5". Pp. xviii + 62. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Edmonds (C. D.)** Greek History for Schools. 8½" × 5½". Pp. xviii + 330, with 37 illustrations, 5 text figures, and 14 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Herculaneusium Voluminum quae supersunt** (Collectio Tertia). 15" × 10½". Pp. 72. Milan: A. Hoepli, 1914. Paper board portfolio, L. 30.
- Kochalsky (A.)** Das Leben und die Lehre Epikurs. 7½" × 5½". Pp. viii + 78. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 1.80.
- Kohler (J.) und Wenger (L.)** Allgemeine Rechtsgeschichte. I. Orientalisches Recht und Recht der Griechen und Römer. Teil II., Abteilung VII. 10" × 6¾". Pp. vi + 302. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 9.
- Livy** (Books I.-V.). Vol. I. R. S. Conway and C. F. Walters. Oxford Text. 7½" × 5". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 4s.
- Mattingly (H.)** Outlines of Ancient History. 8" × 5½". Pp. xii + 482. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Novem Carmina**, in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano magna laude ornata. 10" × 6½". Amsterdam: Muller, 1914.
- Reese (W.)** Die Griechischen Nachrichten über Indien. 9" × 6". Pp. 106. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 3.
- Schmekel (A.)** Die Positive Philosophie im ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwicklung. 2ter Band. 9½" × 6". Pp. x + 290. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914. M. 10.
- Schonack (W.)** Ein Jahrhundert Berliner Philologischer Dissertationen (1810-1910). 8½" × 5". Pp. x + 232. Wolfenbüttel: J. Zwißler, 1914. M. 7.50.
- Tacitus** (Dialogus de Oratoribus). Von A. Gudeman. 2te Auflage. 9½" × 6½". Pp. viii + 528. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 14.
- Wendland (P.)** Rede auf Friedrich Leo. 9½" × 6½". Pp. 24. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914. M. 0.80.

C
liar
ran
γάρ
συν
ἐπι
χρυσ
ἀπο
τακ
cod
θος
φ
veru
ἀλλ
γέσ
κάκ
μυθ
In
τῷ μ
posu
Mnen
παντ
codic
παρέ
bulis
εἶναι
τὸν χ
παρα
coria
dedisse
C. 3
toteles
διέχει
ἀνομά
ἐλαίου
μένειν
Reis
NO. C